6.0| ALTERNATIVES TO PROPOSED ACTION

INTRODUCTION

The following alternatives analyzes potential impacts from the five project alternatives of the proposed project. Each alternative provides a variation on the development program proposed by the CGPU, and is accompanied with an analysis of the respective benefits and impacts. The alternatives are: No Project, Proposed with Distributed Growth, Retail/Entertainment/Job Rich Alternative, Housing Rich Alternative, and Conventional Development Pattern Alterative.

In addition to meeting CEQA requirements for analysis of alternatives relative to the topics analyzed by the EIR, this section will also address the issue of public health and the environmental impacts associated with health. Throughout the CGPU planning process and at the EIR Notice of Preparation Scoping Meeting on March 14, 2013, multiple community members expressed a desire to see an analysis of the health impacts and benefits of the Proposed Project. In response to the community's concern of the potential health impacts of both the Proposed Project, applicable environmental impact topics will identify potential health impacts of the alternative, if any. The following will explain the health benefits of the Proposed Project, followed by the Alternatives Analysis with additional health impacts discussion, as appropriate.

PUBLIC HEALTH BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Public health was a key community concern throughout the CGPU planning process. During the NOP scoping period, several community members expressed a desire for the EIR to consider public health. While public health is not a specific CEQA topic, the City determined that a consideration of public health would be a useful addition to the EIR in the context of evaluating project alternatives. As such, a summary of the expect health outcomes of the proposed project is provided below for context in evaluating the project alternatives.

An individual's health is heavily influenced by the environment's walkability, recreation opportunities, air quality, social equity, economics, transportation safety, food access, unemployment rates, foreclosure rates and access to health facilities within their community. As such, one of the primary outcomes of the proposed CGPU is to implement a development pattern that creates a walkable, well-connected community and encourages community strengthening and safety throughout the City of Coachella.

The CGPU proposes a development pattern that utilizes a high level of street connectivity and smaller block sizes with a mixed land use and multi-modal streets to promote increase opportunities for

residents to walk and bicycle to work, retail, commercial, and community amenities. New parks, along with enhancements to existing parks and recreational facilities, would support greater opportunity for residents and patrons to use open space for physical activity. Air quality standards under the Proposed Project would comply with updated regulations and aim to improve air quality and reduce pollution through encouraging alternatives to automobile use and reducing automobile trip lengths, extensive shading and urban heat island mitigation to reduce local ambient air temperatures and slow ground-level ozone formation, and extensive policies on expanding infrastructure and improving water quality.. Similarly, the CGPU emphasizes preparing for climate change so as to minimize the potential impacts of climate change on the community. Transportation safety is another benefit of reducing personal vehicle use, as it is likely to reduce the number of traffic accidents within the Planning Area. Similarly, the strategies to improve walkability typically serve to slow traffic, which can reduce the rate of fatalities and serious injuries in the event of collisions. The proposed CGPU also addresses built environment factors that would benefit public health including improving healthy food access and access to health facilities. These outcomes are addressed by proposed policies that would increase local food supply, urban agriculture, and an increased level of service and access to healthcare facilities.

Other measures in the proposed CGPU include the support of social systems to create an active and healthy community. The CGPU recognizes the importance of social equity social networks and prioritizes improving the quality of life and health determinants for the most vulnerable residents (e.g., lower-income, young children, older adults, persons with existing chronic diseases, etc.). In policy terms this social equity framework tries to reverse the unequal distribution of services, diverse and quality housing, jobs, schools, and parks. The CGPU proposes nutrition education, community forums for healthy eating, and healthy food access, to improve diets of residents and workers.

Because economic status is a primary determinant of health, the economics of the Planning Area are also considered in the CGPU with policies to support more education and professional skills development for residents to expand and sustain the local economy.

A lack of diverse and high quality housing options along with foreclosure risks can add stress to a family's overall wellbeing where overcrowding, eviction, and/or relocation could reduce quality of life and pose health risks. These housing issues are addressed in the CGPU through policies, programs, and services that provide a greater diversity of housing options and help keep residents in their homes.

Overall, the Proposed Project's vision and goals seek a healthier City through development design and social programs. As discussed above, implementation of the CGPU would increase opportunities to live lifestyle healthier life within the Planning Area.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

As required by CEQA Section 15126.6 (e) a No Project Alternative is to be analyzed for decision makers to evaluate environmental conditions if the proposed project is not adopted. As outlined in CEQA Guidelines 15126.6 (e) "When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the "no project" alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan, policy or operation into the future." In the case of the proposed project, the No Project alternative for the CGPU would be the continuation of the Coachella General Plan Update 2020, adopted by the City of Coachella on October 8, 1998. The existing General Plan 2020, including all of its component goals, policies, and actions would continue to be the guiding development plan for the

Planning Area. Any environmental impacts that would occur under the existing plan, are assumed to occur at the time described by the General Plan Update 2020 EIR, certified October March 1997.

The existing General Plan promotes a conventional suburban development pattern that heavily relies on automobiles as the predominant form of transportation. Under the existing General Plan, the following build out is expected, as described by Table 6.0-1.

Table 6.0-1: 1996 Coachella General Plan Land Use Summary

LAND USE	DWELLING UNITS	BUILDING AREA (SF)	POPULATION	ACRES
Residential	29,577		89,913	14,704
Commercial	2,974	4,059,000	9,041	3,960
Industrial		50,983,000		4,528
Agriculture	596		1,812	14,563
Public		89,300		1,103
Open Space				7,090
Thermal Airport		3,765,700		2,273
Specific Plans	17,350	2,464,300	52,744	4,103
Transportation				1,206
Total	50,497	61,361,300	153,510	53,530
Source: City of Coachella General Plan EIR, 1998.				

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

AESTHETICS

As described in Section 4.1, aesthetics views and scenic vistas currently exist within the Planning Area, especially views of the Mecca Hills and views from regional freeways and highways. Under the No Project Alternative, build out of the Planning Area and population growth, will turn the Planning Area into a mid-sized City, much like the result anticipated under the Proposed Project. The No Project Alternative also focuses on residential development, and reduction in agriculture and open space land. Under the No Project Alternative, the eastern edge of the City would not be preserved as a contiguous band of open space. Under this alternative, the City would grow to a greater population at a lower density, thus leading to more widespread development and more widespread need for night lighting. Like the Proposed Project, the No Project would result in significant unavoidable impacts to visual character. Additionally, because the No Project would not preserve Subarea 17 as contiguous open space and because the development footprint would be greater, impacts to scenic views and light and glare would be somewhat greater than that of the Proposed Project, although these impacts would likely not be significant and unavoidable due to existing City regulations.

The Proposed Project focuses on urban form and character, and provides development with well-directed design guidance, and policies to incorporate high quality architecture, complete streets, and aesthetically cohesive development to create a unique sense of place. The Proposed Project also calls

for Subarea 17 to be completely preserved for open space, with no development potential and encourages development to first occur in the western portion of the Planning Area. Though the Proposed Project would result in significant aesthetics impacts within the Planning Area, including potential for hillside development, policies within the Proposed Project address aesthetics impacts with more defined development direction than the No Project Alternative to maintain the high aesthetic value of the Planning Area. Thus, the No Project Alternative would be considered environmentally inferior to the Proposed Project.

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture land, made up of farm land, prime farmland, and farmland of local importance, exists within the Planning Area, and provides an environmental benefit for local habitat, and economic benefits for local businesses through food and fiber production. Both the No Project Alternative, and the Proposed Project, would result in the loss of agricultural land to urban development within the Planning Area. As reported by the 1998 General Plan EIR, the No Project Alternative was expected to retain 14,563 acres of agricultural land and result in the loss of 9,271 acres while. However, the current agriculture acreage in the Planning Area is only 11,174 acres, indicating the No Project Alternative was perhaps less effective at protecting agriculture than originally expected and that the total acreage of preserved agricultural land might be as low as the balance of 1903 acres of the original land inventory. The proposed project would retain 3,600 acres and result in the loss of 9,862. Additionally, the No Project Alternative does call for agricultural preservation or the reservation of Subarea 16 for agriculture until much of the City is built out. The Proposed Project provides more specific details on agricultural preservation and use. The Proposed Project also proposes agricultural buffers to protect farmland, use of parks and open space for crop growth, and supports agriculture within the urban core of the Planning Area. The loss of large quantities of agricultural land under both alternatives would be considered significant and unavoidable. Because the Proposed Project contains strategic policies to protect and reduce environmental impacts and because the total acreage of preserved agricultural land under the Proposed Project would be slightly greater, the No Project is conserved environmentally inferior to the Proposed Project.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Planning Area remains largely undeveloped in areas where biological resources including sensitive habitat occur, and that would be negatively impacted from urban development. Since the time of adoption of the existing plan on October 7, 1998, additional habitat conservation programs have been implemented in the region. The Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (CVMSHCP) is part of a regional multiple species conservation plan set in motion in 2004. This plan, adopted in 2008, has included the Coachella Valley Fringe-Toed Lizard and many other sensitive species within the region, and has allocated land to conserve and protect sensitive species. The No Project Alternative largely aligns with the CVMSHCP, but does allocate low density residential development to a preservation area in the northwest corner of Subarea 13, which would be in conflict with the CVMSHCP and could result in a significant unavoidable impact. Additionally, the No Project does not plan for large areas of contiguous open space in Subarea 17, which would result in greater impacts to biota through the fragmentation of habitat. Conversely, the CGPU does not propose development on lands that have been allocated to the CVMSHCP, and proposes policy to require development to comply with the existing regulatory system, provide buffers to protect sensitive species, and promote preserve land as a development exchange. For these reasons, the No Project Alternative is considered to be environmentally inferior.

Cultural Resources

The Planning Area includes a rich history of early California settlements, and tribal use prior to City incorporation. The Salton Sea is located over five miles south of the Planning Area. The sea is a smaller water body from a previous lake called Ancient Lake Cahuilla, which historically had shorelines closer to the Planning Area. Because of this close proximity to the Planning Area, the Salton Sea basin indicates a notable presence of known and possibly unknown cultural resources in the vicinity of the Planning Area. With respect to cultural resources, both the No Project and the Proposed Project alternatives propose similar development scenarios: large quantities of growth and development. Full build out of both the No Project alternative and Proposed Project would build around existing historic resources, and could lead to discovery of new cultural or paleontological resources. The No Project Alternative provides mitigation techniques involving treatment, preservation, and protection of any known or discovered cultural resources. These policies are similar to those in the Proposed Project, and address potential environmental impacts. Because both the No Project Alternative and Proposed Project contain similar policies that address potential impacts on cultural resources, impacts to cultural resources under the both alternatives would be considered to be less than significant. Thus, the No Project is neither environmentally inferior nor superior to the Proposed Project.

Geology and Seismic Hazards

The Planning Area is subject to ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, and erosion; all of which place development at risk for these geological hazards. The No Project Alternative would add additional buildings and housing to the Planning Area that are located in close proximity to various faults, including the San Andreas Fault Line. The No Project Alternative and policies within the Proposed Project include similar strategies for avoiding or reducing potential geologic and seismic hazards for all development occurring in areas subject to geological hazards. The No Project Alternative is projected to develop for a population of 153,000 by 2020, whereas the Proposed Project has projected the population to reach 135,000 by 2035. This reduced population project would also reduce the number of structures and housing units needed to accommodate the population. The decreased population would place less housing units at risk for geological hazards within the Planning Area. Finally, the Proposed Project includes numerous policies in the Safety Element prepared to specifically address deficiencies in the No Project plan as shown by housing that was inadvertently built on a trace of the San Andreas Fault. Thus the No Project and would be the environmentally inferior plan for impacts from geological hazards.

Hazardous Materials

The No Project Alternative has the potential to increase hazardous material within the Planning Area, through construction, industrial practices, or use of toxic substances. The Proposed Project also holds the same potential to add hazardous materials, expose sensitive receptors to hazardous materials, and generate the transportation of hazardous materials throughout the Planning Area. The No Project Alternative aims to reduce hazardous material in order to reduce impacts from hazardous materials. However, the Proposed Project provides more specific and comprehensive policies addressing hazardous materials within the Planning Area. The proposed project also proposes development compliance with any local, state, or federal regulations, and preventing use, disposal, or exposure of hazardous materials in the Planning Area. Based on additional policy measures of the proposed project, the No Project alternative would be environmentally inferior.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Planning Area's sole water source comes from the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin, making up a portion of the Colorado River Basin, and is serviced by the Coachella Valley Water District. The Proposed Project projects population growth to reach 135,000 people by 2035. This population would create a demand 8,878 million gallons per day. The No Project Alternative is projected to grow the Planning Area to a population of over 153,000 requiring more water supply to meet the growth in demand than the Proposed Project. As discussed in Section 4.16, the Planning Area's ground water basin water source would have enough water supply to support the projected population under the Proposed Project. Additional water demand would generate more need for ground water recharge, or higher potential for overdraft of the existing water supply. Additional development under both alternatives would also contribute to changes in surface hydrology and increased pollutants in runoff. As the No Project would result in more people and more development, impacts to water quality could be somewhat greater. Poor water quality can decrease the amount of clean water residents have access to and could impact health of sensitive populations from increased potential exposure to contaminated water, or dehydration from lack of clean water.

The No Project Alternative is projected to grow the Planning Area to a population of over 150,000 requiring more water supply to meet the growth in demand that than the Proposed Project. Based on the population projections of the Proposed Project and the No Project Alternative, the Proposed Project would be superior as it would result in less impact on water supply, water quality, and water entitlements.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

The Planning Area's total acreage is 45,300 acres, 18,530 of which are developed and 27,000 of which are undeveloped. The land use program of the No Project Alternative would continue to develop the Planning Area with an emphasis on separation of land uses, which may help prevent land use conflicts but would not likely achieve the goals of the RTP/SCS, SB 375, or AB 32, as described in the Land Use Section of this EIR. Conflicts with these plans would be considered significant unavoidable impacts. The No Project Alternative would also contribute to residents' car dependency to move around the Planning Area. This auto-oriented model would reduce residents' activity levels that could in-turn generate health risks associated with inactivity including weight gain, poor cardiovascular health, and reduced immune system. The land use plan of the Proposed Project provides land use designations that allow for flexibility within the context of identified place types. The Proposed Project allows for a varied mix of land uses to promote connectivity and walkability for residents and patrons. Additionally, the land use plan of the Proposed Project is compatible with applicable plans and regulations that have been update or added since the time of adoption of the No Project Alternative, such as AB 32 and SB 375. Because the Proposed Project is in compliance with the most current regulations, and it promotes a more sustainable development pattern, the Proposed Project is environmentally superior to the No Project Alterative.

CIRCULATION

The existing circulation pattern within the Planning Area is operating at a level of service of C or better, except for Jackson Street, and Harrison Street, and SR-86S, which are operating at a D level of service (congested). The No Project Alternative would continue to generate additional traffic, based on the 153,000 population projection by 2020. It is expected, that at full implementation of the No Project Alternative, congestion would impact areas along Harrison/Grapefruit (SR-111)/Dillon Road Corridor, and the Tyler/Grapefruit/Avenue 52 corridor. Additional vehicles on the road would also increase potential for traffic related accidents, creating additional safety issues with between automobiles, pedestrians, and cyclists. The Proposed Project would also generate additional traffic throughout the

Planning Area, and has been determined to potentially generate significant and unavoidable impacts on road segments SR86 and Interstate-. However, the Proposed Project would generate fewer automobile trips and less annual VMT. For these reasons, the No Project Alternative is considered to be environmentally inferior.

NOISE

Additional development in the Planning Area could generate noise levels that reach decibel levels generating annoyance, hearing loss, speech interference or physiological responses. The No Project Alterative would continue development, and generate significant and unavoidable impacts along Harrison Street and Avenue 52, as determined in the General Plan 2020 EIR, in March 1997. The Proposed Project would generate noise levels about comfort levels along major road corridors, and has a land use pattern and policies that reduce noise levels to a level of less than significant. Based on the significant and unavoidable impacts generated by the No Project Alternative, the Proposed Project would be superior to the No Project Alternative.

AIR QUALITY

Air quality within the Planning Area has the potential to decrease, as additional population and activity could generate pollutants and emissions into the Planning Area. The No Project Alternative, at full build out, would generate 9.4 tons/day of VOCs, 1.7 tons/day of NO_x, 87.6 tons/day of CO, 1.7 tons/day of SO_x, and 3.2 tons/day of PM_{10}. These emissions would not violate AQMD thresholds of significance. The Proposed Project build-out is estimated to generate 2.38 tons/day of VOCs, 2.82 tons/day of NO_x, 13.06 tons/day of CO, 0.01 tons/day of SO_x, and 0.23 tons/day of $PM_{2.5}$, generating no Significant and Unavoidable impacts and complying with regional air quality standards. The No Project Alternative would generate more emissions and air pollutants into the Planning Area, and exceed air quality standings, and would also generate negative respiratory health impacts from constant exposure to increased levels of air pollutants due to its greater reliance on the automobile, greater per capita VMT, and greater population. Decreased air quality also has a direct effect on public health. Thus, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally inferior.

GREENHOUSE GASES

The Planning Area emissions total for 2010 was 382,787Metric Tons of CO_2e. The No Project Alternative, and EIR for the No Project Alternative does not have a GHG impact analysis, and was adopted prior to AB 32. The No Project Alternative does not contain substantive policies to reduce GHG emissions, would not comply with AB 32 standards, and could exceed GHG emissions thresholds. The Proposed Project also includes a Climate Action Plan, and GHG emissions reducing policies. These combined efforts will help reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and comply with new legislation including California Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) and meet both 2020 and 2035 SCAQMD targets. Because the Proposed Project has taken GHG inventory for the Planning Area, and plans to meet AB 32 targets by 2020, the No Project Alternative is inferior to the Proposed Project.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The 2010 population for the Planning Area was 40,704, and 8,998 housing units. The No Project Alternative would continue to develop the Planning Area and reach the projected population of 153,510 with an estimated 50,497 dwelling units. The Proposed Project proposes approximately 33,000 dwelling units. It is projected that the 2035 population of the Planning Area would reach 135,000 with 15,205 single family dwelling units, and 18,264 multiple family dwelling units under the proposed project. Neither the proposed project nor the No Project alternative would have significant environmental impacts. Thus, neither alternative is superior.

PUBLIC UTILITIES

Public Utilities within the Planning Area are made up of natural gas, electricity, telecommunications, and solid waste. The resource commitment to supply a planned mid-sized city with all utilities necessary to sustain a thriving community and economy, requires a large infrastructure and energy commitment. The No Project Alternative would require enough infrastructure to be built to maintain quality of life standards for existing, and equal quality of life and level of service for a population of 153,000. The Proposed Project would require enough infrastructure to be built to maintain quality of life standards for existing, and equal quality of life and level of service for a population of 135,000. . The higher population projection under the No Project Alternative would generate a greater need for utilities infrastructure with greater potential to cause negative environmental impacts. The increased infrastructure would also require additional funding for construction and maintenance to meet demands of the larger population under the No Project Alternative. The Proposed Project would require the same level of service as the No Project Alternative, but for a small population of 135,000, leaving the potential environmental impacts less than those of the No Project Alterative. Thus, the Proposed Project would be environmentally superior to the No Project Alternative.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Public Services within the Planning Area include law protection, fire protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities. The Planning Area's level of service for all public services currently operates below county standards. The No Project Alterative is the existing General Plan 2020, which the Planning Area is currently developing under, and has not been able to generate adequate level of service to the Planning Area. Additionally, the No Project Alternative has a higher population projection than the Proposed Project, and could require more public service facilities to meet the additional population by 2020, and have determined environmental impacts to be considered on a site by site development process. The No Project Alternative does not promote a well-connected street pattern which would improve access to parks and other public services, decreasing potential for outdoor activity and recreation opportunities and improved emergency response times. The Proposed CGPU proposes to reach and maintain level of service for all public services within the Planning Area. Though the development of additional public service facilities could generate negative environmental impacts, the Proposed Project contains policies that reduce impacts to less than significant., The population projection of the proposed GCPU would require fewer facilities to be built to meet level of service standards, and would generate less associated environmental impacts than those generated by the No Project Alternative, making the Proposed Project superior to the No Project Alterative.

WATER SUPPLY

This topic includes waste water, and water supply. The Planning Area's sole water source comes from the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin, making up a portion of the Colorado River Basin, and is serviced by the Coachella Valley Water District. The No Project Alternative would generate 34,565,270 gallons per day of waste water, and an additional 12,110,805 gallons per day of water demand. The No Project Alternative requires greater water demand and greater wastewater facilities to service the Planning Area. The added wastewater projections under the No Project Alternative would create additional risk to water contamination and water quality issues for residents, which would create negative health impacts from reduced access to clean water supplies. The Proposed Project projects population growth to reach approximately 135,000 people by 2035. This population would create a demand 8,878 million gallons per day, creating potential water quality issues for the source, and output waterways within the Planning Area. Additional water demand would generate more need for ground water recharge, or higher potential for overdraft of the existing water supply. Thus, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally inferior.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not fulfill the project's objectives. The No Project Alternative would not support well-connected land use patterns, implement the most recent innovations in infrastructure, social services and environmental sustainability, or provide adaptable land-use designations or strategies to adapt to demographic changes, or any unforeseen changes in the economic market. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not result in the update of older, outdated development plans, reduce community greenhouse gas emissions, or foster the community's desire for safe, active transportation. Though the No Project Alternative could handle the expected population growth, the development pattern is not in-line with the community's vision, or any recent local, state, or federal regulations.

CONCLUSION

The No Project Alternative results in more impacts to the following areas: agricultural resources, aesthetics, biological resources, , hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, circulation, noise, air quality, GHG emissions, public utilities, public services, and water supply. Of these resource areas, impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, land use and planning, circulation, noise, and GHG emissions would likely be significant and unavoidable impacts. Neither the No Project Alternative nor the Proposed Project is superior with regards to cultural impacts as both the No Project Alternative and Proposed Project would handle the impact, preservation, and protection of cultural resources similarly. Neither the No Project Alternative nor the Proposed Project is superior with regards to population and housing as neither would generate significant environmental impacts. Overall, the No Project Alterative would continue to develop the Planning Area under an older model of community design, with less focus on creating of sustainable, thriving, and an economically sound community. The Proposed Project provides a mix of uses throughout the Planning Area, and meets both the project objectives and community goals of a more walkable city with easy access to retail, commercial, schools, and open space.

DISTRIBUTED GROWTH ALTERNATIVE

The Proposed Project anticipates the Planning Area's population growth to reach 135,000 by 2035. This growth is proposed to be somewhat concentrated in the western and central portions of the Planning Area, most closely adjacent to the current urban areas, and extending eastward along Avenue 50 and 52 into the hillsides of Subarea 14. The Distributed Growth alternative would not include any policy that would direct growth to preferred growth subareas or away from future growth areas. It allows for the population to remain at 135,000 by 2035, however the population distribution would be expected to develop more evenly throughout the Planning Area over the course of the next two decades, rather than restricting development in certain areas of the City until later in the planning period after the core of the City is developed by at least 60%. Overall, land use designations and total growth potential for each Subarea would remain as proposed by the CGPU. Additionally, this alternative expects that more development would occur in Subarea 13 by 2035 than expected under the Proposed Project. This would redistribute population density, development, and increase population within the eastern, northern, and southern areas of the Planning Area. This alternative was selected for analysis to address concerns raised by some property owners that any policies that would restrict growth in any Subarea of the City or focus growth in certain areas of the City would interfere with market dynamics.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

AESTHETICS

The Distributed Growth Alternative would still result in the development of the Planning Area into a mid-sized city as anticipated under the proposed project with similar design and community character direction as provide by the proposed project. However, with no direction on when and where growth should occur, development would be somewhat more widespread and aesthetic benefits of reserve development in Subarea 16 would not be fully realized. Additionally, the fractured development pattern that would occur with a similar population growth occurring over a broader geographic area, would result in an incomplete urban form broken up by undeveloped patches of land. Finally, aesthetics views and scenic vistas occur within the Planning Area, especially from the Mecca Hills and regional freeways intersection the Planning Area. Under the Proposed Project, these resources could potentially be impacted and lose aesthetic value that provides a visually appealing environment for residents and patrons. Visual resources would be similarly impacted under the Distributed Growth Alternative with new development occurring throughout the Planning Area. Because the aesthetic impacts would be more widespread, the aesthetic of the Distributed Growth Alternative would also be significant and unavoidable. Thus, this alternative would be environmentally inferior.

AGRICULTURE

Under the Distributed Growth Alternative, the same number of homes and square feet of non-residential space would be built to accommodate the same population and growth in the local economy. The same acreage of land would likely be committed to urban uses under this alternative, with additional land necessary for infrastructure and roadways to connect the more widely distributed population. Some of the agriculture land committed to urban development under the Proposed Project may not have to be developed as non-agricultural lands in the City's hillside would accommodate development anticipated in the valley. However, Subarea 16, which contains the greatest amount of preserved agricultural land under the CGPU would be more severely impacted as it develops with urban uses. With more widely distributed development, indirect impacts to agriculture arising from urban land adjacency would be greater. The close proximity of urban development and agricultural lands would increase risk and exposure of pesticides from agricultural uses, and may generate long-term health impacts, including

cancer or birth defects associated with pesticide exposure. Furthermore, agricultural areas would be fragmented and the 20+ year agricultural reserve proposed for Subarea 16 would not occur. Thus, impacts to agricultural resources would be slightly more extensive under this alternative and the impacts would still be significant and unavoidable.

Biological Resources

Under the Distributed Growth Alternative, potential biological impacts could be a bit more extensive as the footprint of the City would be somewhat bigger than it would under the Proposed Project. Thus, there is a greater potential of lost habitat and foraging land. However, the Distributed Growth Alternative would include the same policies proposed under the CGPU that would respect the conservation goals of the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (CVMSHCP). As with the Proposed Project, the conservation lands identified by the CVMSHCP would still be off limits to new development. Thus, the Distributed Growth Alternative would have slightly greater impacts to biological resources, but impacts to sensitive habitat and sensitive species would be very similar as those anticipated under the Proposed Project. While this alternative would not create significant environmental impacts, it is considered to be the environmentally inferior alternative.

Cultural Resources

Under the Distributed Growth Alternative, the overall footprint of the City would be somewhat bigger and, thus, there is a greater potential impact to cultural resources. However, like the Proposed Project, development under the Distributed Growth Alternative would respect existing historic resources and utilize the same policies and mitigations techniques of the Proposed Project, such as treatment, preservation, and protection of any newly discovered cultural resources. As with the Proposed Project, it is anticipated that potential impacts to cultural resources would be fully mitigated through these techniques and no significant impacts would occur. Thus, impacts are expected to be similar to those of the Proposed Project.

Geology and Seismic Hazards

The Planning Area is subject to ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, and erosion, place development at risk for these geological hazards. Like the Proposed Project, the Distributed Growth Alternative would add additional buildings and housing to the Planning Area that are located in close proximity to various faults, including the San Andreas Fault Line. The Distributed Growth Alternative and policies within the Proposed Project address similar strategies for development review and applicable mitigation for all development occurring in areas subject to geological hazards. While the new development occurring under the Distributed Growth Alternative would be over a greater area of the Planning Area, the strategies proposed in the General Plan for reducing geologic impacts would not change, and, thus impacts would not be more severe than those anticipated under the Proposed Project and no significant impacts would occur.

Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Project has potential to increase hazardous material within the Planning Area, through construction, industrial practices, or use of toxic substances. The Distributed Growth Alternative also holds the same potential to add hazardous materials, expose sensitive receptors to hazardous materials, and generate the transportation of hazardous materials through the Planning Area as the magnitude of development of this alternative would be the same as that of the Proposed Project. All of the policies in the Proposed Project that pertain to the control of hazardous materials and all applicable local, state, and federal regulations that pertain to the control of hazardous materials would still apply. Thus, the

impacts of the Distributed Growth Alternative would be largely the same as those of the Proposed Project and no significant impacts would be created.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Planning Area's sole water source comes from the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin, and is serviced by the Coachella Valley Water District. The Proposed Project projects population growth to reach 135,000 people by 2035. This population would create a demand 8,878 million gallons per day, creating potential water quality issues for the source, and output waterways within the Planning Area. As discussed in Section 4.16, the Planning Area's ground water basin water source would have enough water supply to support the projected population under the Proposed Project. The Distributed Growth Alternative is projected to grow the Planning Area to the same population and economy as the Proposed Project. The primary difference would be the broader extent of development across the City. As such, the City would have a greater area of land committed to roads and infrastructure necessary to serve a more spread out population. The additional roadways and infrastructure would have a slightly greater impact with regards to landscaping water demand, groundwater infiltration, and the generation of storm water runoff. Thus, the Distributed Growth Alternative would be inferior with regards to hydrology and water quality but would not generate any environmental impacts.

Land Use and Planning

The land use program of the Distributed Growth Alternative would not substantively change the type of development anticipated under the Proposed Project. However, development would be spread out over a greater area and would be more discontinuous. The City's strategies to improve walkability and accessibility as means to reducing greenhouse gases, improve public health, and comply with the goals of AB 32 and SB 375 would be inhibited under this alternative. As such, more driving would be expected and more vehicle miles traveled would be generated. These effects would inhibit the City's ability to meet the GHG and VMT reduction targets of AB 32 and SB 375, respectively. Additionally, there would likely be increased noise and air pollution and reduced public health benefits resulting from an increase in driving. Otherwise, the Distributed Growth Alternative would be expected to comply with other applicable plans such as the RTP and the Airport Land Use Plan. Thus, the Distributed Growth Alternative would have slightly greater impacts relative to land use and planning and impacts due to conflicts with regional plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and VMT would be significant and unavoidable.

Circulation

The existing circulation pattern within the Planning Area is operating at a level of service of C or better, except for Jackson Street, and Harrison Street, and SR-86S, which are operating at a D level of service (congested). The Proposed Project would generate additional traffic throughout the Planning Area, and has been determined to potentially generate significant and unavoidable impacts on regional road segments on SR86 and Interstate-10 passing through the northeastern portion of the Planning Area. The Distributed Growth Alternative would generate additional traffic as the trip- and VMT-reduction benefits of the proposed land use program would be less effective with a more distributed growth pattern. It is expected that at full implementation of the Distributed Growth Alternative, congestion would impact similar areas as the under the Proposed Project and similar significant unavoidable impacts would occur. However, as the Distributed Growth Alternative would generate more traffic, congestion impacts could be more severe and more widespread. The additional congestion and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would also cause greater auto-dependency and reduce active transportation opportunities, which could contribute to negative health impacts including weight gain, cardiovascular weakness, and loss in quality of life from more time spent driving per day, than with

family or being active. Thus, the Distributed Growth Alternative would have greater impacts and is considered environmentally inferior.

NOISE

Additional development in the Planning Area could generate noise levels that reach decibel levels generating annoyance, hearing loss, speech interference or physiological responses. The Proposed Project would generate noise levels at comfort levels along major road corridors, and has a land use pattern and policies that reduce noise levels to a level of less than significant. The Distributed Growth Alterative would result in the same amount of development, but result in that development being spread out over a greater area of the City. As such, there would be greater volumes of traffic. Greater volumes of traffic would lead to greater noise levels along major corridors, including noise impacts on houses located adjacent to major thoroughfares. However, it is expected that the policies proposed within the Proposed Project would be able to prevent noise levels under the Distributed Growth Alternative from generating significant impacts. Thus, impacts would be slightly greater under the Distributed Growth Alternative.

AIR QUALITY

Air quality within the Planning Area has the potential to decrease, as additional population and activity could generate pollutants and emissions into the Planning Area. The Proposed Project build-out is estimated to generate 2.32 tons/day of VOCs, 7.65 tons/day of NO_x, 11.47 tons/day of CO, 0.02 tons/day of SO_x, and 0.33 tons/day of $PM_{2.5}$, generating no Significant and Unavoidable impacts and complying with regional air quality standards. The Distributed Growth Alternative, at full build out, would likely generate greater amounts of criteria air pollutants as the more spread out development pattern would result in greater levels of traffic generation, but impacts are not expected to be significant. Additional air pollutants would also contribute to negative health impacts on respiratory systems, and could cause short-term and long term respiratory illnesses. Based on these factors, the Distributed Growth Alternative would have greater impacts relative to air quality.

GREENHOUSE GASES

The Planning Area emissions total for 2010 was 382,787Metric Tons of CO_2e. The Proposed Project also includes a Climate Action Plan, and GHG emissions reducing policies. These combined efforts will help reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and comply with new legislation including California Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32). The Distributed Growth Alternative would rely on the same framework for reducing GHG emissions, but would generate greater levels of traffic and VMT due to the spread out pattern of development. The increased GHG emissions levels from transportation activities would likely exceed the City's GHG reduction target for 2020 and the increased emissions would have a greater impact on atmospheric concentrations of CO_2e. Because of this, the Distributed Growth Alternative is inferior to the Proposed Project and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The 2010 population for the Planning Area was 40,704, and 8,998 housing units. It is projected that the 2035 population of the Planning Area would reach 135,000 with 15,205 single family dwelling units, and 18,264 multiple family dwelling units under the proposed project. The Distributed Growth Alternative would result in the same number of new dwelling units and the same future population. However, the population would be spread out over a greater extent of the Planning Area. No additional impacts are expected under this scenario. Neither the proposed project nor the Distributed Growth alternative would have significant environmental impacts and impacts are anticipated to be the same.

PUBLIC UTILITIES

Public Utilities within the Planning Area are made up of natural gas, electricity, telecommunications, solid waste, waste water, and water supply. The resource commitment to supply a planned mid-sized city with all utilities necessary to sustain a thriving community and economy, requires a large infrastructure and energy commitment. The Distributed Growth Alternative would also generate a less than significant impact on utilities infrastructure, as it would require a level of service to meet the same size population over a greater extent of the Planning Area. This would result in a greater potential to cause negative environmental impacts as more infrastructure would be necessary to bridge the greater extent of development, although impacts would not be significantly greater. The additional need for infrastructure to reach the distributed development would require a reallocation of financial resources towards infrastructure construction and maintenance, and away from services that could benefit the community and overall health of community members. Thus, the Distributed Growth Alternative would be slightly more impactful than the Proposed Alternative.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Public Services within the Planning Area include law protection, fire protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities. The Planning Area's level of service for all public services currently operates below county standards. The Proposed Project proposes to reach and maintain level of service for all public services within the Planning Area. Though the development of additional public service facilities could generate negative environmental impacts, the Proposed Project contains policies that reduce impacts to less than significant. The Distributed Growth Alterative would put greater demands on service providers as the same population would have to be serviced across a greater geographic area, which is less efficient and more costly. Additionally, more public service facilities might be necessary in order to maintain response times within the greater geographic area, placing greater populations at risk of injury or death from an emergency, based on slower response times. For these reasons, impacts under the Distributed Growth Alternative would be slightly greater, not significant.

WATER SUPPLY

Though the Distributed Growth Alternative has the same population and housing projections as the Proposed Project, the distributed development pattern would create a larger footprint that could require additional water demand for landscaping, or could increase urban runoff from increased impervious surfaces. Weather the development strategy of the Distributed Growth Alternative would require greater water use for landscaping, or additional pollutants from urban runoff, the alternative would have greater environmental impacts than the Proposed Project, but not significant.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Implementation of the Distributed Growth Alternative would not fulfill all of the project's objectives. The Distributed Growth Alternative would not effectively support well-connected land use patterns, implement the most recent innovations in infrastructure, social services and environmental sustainability, or provide adaptable land-use designations or strategies to adapt to demographic changes, or any unforeseen changes in the economic market. Additionally, the Distributed Growth Alternative would not result in the update of older, outdated development plans, reduce community greenhouse gas emissions, of foster the community's desire for safe, active transportation. Though the Distributed Growth Alternative could handle the expected population growth, the disconnected development pattern is not in-line with the community's.

CONCLUSION

The Distributed Growth Alternative results in slightly greater impacts to the following areas: agriculture, aesthetics, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, circulation, noise, air quality, GHG emissions, population and housing, public utilities, public services, and water supply. Significant impacts would occur with regards to agriculture, aesthetics, land use and planning, circulation, and GHG emissions. Neither the Distributed Growth Alternative nor the Proposed Project is superior in regards to cultural impacts, geologic and seismic hazards, and hazardous materials. Overall, the Distributed Growth Alterative would lead to development of the Planning Area in a less connected pattern that would less effectively encourage walkability and encourage a greater reliance on automobiles, reduce potential of residents to live healthy and active lives. Because this alternative would not meet all of the project objectives and would create additional significant unavoidable impacts, this alternative was rejected.

RETAIL/COMMERCIAL/ENTERTAINMENT RICH ALTERNATIVE

The Retail/Entertainment/Job Rich alternative proposes a stronger emphasis on employment generation within the Downtown Core, on Van Buren, on Harrison, and in the Commercial Entertainment area. The CGPU proposes these areas to be mixed use with neighborhood and regional centers supported by vertically and horizontally mixed residential uses arranged in patterns that support walking, bicycling, and transit. This alternative would shift a mixed-use focus to a higher concentration of employment-oriented uses. This would also decrease the projected population, reduce number of housing units, and increase jobs within the Planning Area. The proposed alternative could potentially secure more of an economic base for the Planning Area, establish Coachella as an economic anchor for the region, provide more jobs within the Downtown core, and generate a better jobs housing balance for the City. This alternative was chosen to address to concerns. First, the community is generally very interested in economic development and especially in economic development that results in new job opportunities for residents. Second, the propose CGPU would result in a significant unavoidable impact to SR-86 and I-10 due to increased congestion. A project that increases in-town jobs has the potential to help alleviate that congestion by reducing regional trips that originate in Coachella.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

AESTHETIC

The Retail Rich Alternative would develop the planning area to a population of 125,000, 10,000 residents under the Proposed Project population of 135,000. The design of the Retail Rich Alternative would still match the character vision outlined in the Proposed Project, but residential and non-residential uses within the Planning Area would be more sharply divided. The Retail Rich Alternative would generate less connected development patterns concentrating retail in certain areas rather than creating a consistent mixture of building types. The overall scale of growth expected in the Planning Area would be much the same as expected under the CGPU with a similar gross footprint of development. As such, the visual character of the Planning Area would still experience significant change from rural farmland to an urban environment. . Based on the similar building footprint and development characteristics of the Retail Rich Alternative and the Proposed Project, the Planning Area would not experience greater or lesser environmental impacts on aesthetics difference from the Retail Rich Alternative and aesthetic impacts would still be significant.

AGRICULTURE

The Retail Rich Alternative would decrease the Planning Area population by 10,000 but much of the reduction in units would be expected to occur in the denser, mixed use areas of the City. Thus, the overall footprint of development under this alternative would be largely the same as envisioned under the CGPU. Accordingly, the impacts to agricultural land would be very similar as anticipated under the CGPU. Additionally, this alternative would also result in a significant unavoidable impact to agriculture.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Retail Rich Alternative would transform the Planning Area into a strong retail, commercial, entertainment hub for the Coachella Valley, and would reduce residential units by 4,000 less than the Proposed Project. Under this alternative, the mix of uses would change, but the overall scale of development anticipated would be very similar as expected under the CGPU. Additionally, no changes to policies regard biotic resources or open space would occur with this alternative. As such, impacts to biotic resources would be nearly identical. Thus, the Retail Rich Alternative would not have a greater or lesser environmental impact than that of the Proposed Project and no significant impacts to biotic resources would occur.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Retail Rich Alternative proposes to focus development around retail, commercial, and entertainment uses that could develop next to historic resources, to uncover cultural resources during the construction of the Retail Rich Alternative. The Retail Rich Alternative would develop under the same policies as the Proposed Project that proposes protocol for the protection and treatment of cultural resources. Additionally, the overall magnitude of development would be very similar under this alternative with the same general footprint of citywide development occurring. Thus, impacts to cultural resources would be the same as with the CGPU and no significant impacts would occur.

GEOLOGY AND SEISMIC HAZARDS

The Retail Rich Alternative would have 10,000 less residents and 4,000 fewer dwelling units in the Planning Area than the Proposed Project. Thus, under this alternative, fewer residential structures would be at risk of geological and seismic hazards. The Retail Rich Alternative would also develop under the policies of the Proposed Project that propose strategies to reduce impacts on structures and populations from geological and seismic hazards of the Planning Area. Because of the smaller population projection of the Retail Rich Alternative, the environmental impacts from geological and seismic hazards would be slightly less than the Proposed Project and no significant impacts would occur.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The Proposed Project has potential to increase hazardous material within the Planning Area, through construction, industrial practices, and use of toxic substances. The Retail Rich Alternative would shift development from dwelling units to retail, commercial, and entertainment activity. The impact of hazardous material in the development of housing, versus retail, commercial, or entertainment activity would likely be similar as both could potentially use or expose populations to hazardous materials in the Planning Area. Because the Retail Rich Alternative would develop under the same policies as the Proposed Project, potential impacts from hazardous materials would also be less than significant. Based on the similar characteristics of activities carried out on housing and retail, commercial, and entertainment is would be determined that the Retail Rich Alternative would generally have a similar environmental impact from hazardous materials than the Proposed Project.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Planning Area's sole water source comes from the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin, making up a portion of the Colorado River Basin, and is serviced by the Coachella Valley Water District. The Proposed Project projects population growth to reach 135,000 people by 2035. This population would create a demand of 8,878 million gallons per day, creating potential water quality issues for the source, and output waterways within the Planning Area. As discussed in Section 4.16, the Planning Area's ground water basin water source would have enough water supply to support the projected population under the Proposed Project. The Retail Rich Alternative would reduce water demand from dwelling units, but would increase demand from retail, commercial, and entertainment uses and overall water demand is anticipated to be very similar as that of the CGPU. Additionally, the same policies regarding water quality would still apply to this alternative and the same general footprint of development would occur with this alternative. Thus impacts to hydrology and water quality would be largely the same and no significant impacts would occur relative to hydrology and water quality would occur with this alternative.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

The land use patterns under the Retail Rich Alternative would decrease the residential dwelling unit footprint and increase land designated for commercial, retail, and entertainment uses decreasing overall land footprint from the Proposed Project. The Retail Rich Alternative would develop in generally the same footprint as expected under the CGPU. This alternative would develop in a more distinct and separated land use pattern that could create environmental impacts cause from segregated land uses, and could hinder compliance with local, state, or federal regulations addressing air quality and GHG emissions. These conflicts would result in significant impacts relative to plan compliance. Thus, impacts relative to land use plan and planning would be greater and result in a significant impact due to inconsistency with regional plans.

CIRCULATION

The Retail Rich Alternative would develop the Planning Area with less housing units and more non-residential uses. This would contribute to less peak-hour congestion on regional roadways as more jobs and services would be available in the Planning Area. Thus, traffic patterns would shift in origin and in timing, with a greater number of trips originating outside the Planning Area with destinations in the Planning Area. Also, these would likely be off peak trips, would help reduce peak hour traffic congestion on regional roads. However, this alternative would also result in greater local traffic due to a greater separation of uses that cannot be as effectively served by alternative transportation. The Retail Rich Alternative would actually help regional congestion by reducing need to leave city for work, and would also help reduce, but not eliminate, significant unavoidable traffic impact. The Proposed Project would generate additional traffic throughout the Planning Area, and has been determined to potentially generate significant and unavoidable impacts on regional road segments on SR86 and Interstate-10 passing through the northeastern portion of the Planning Area. Thus, the Retail Rich Alternative would have less impact on regional traffic and similar impacts on local traffic than the Proposed Project and impacts would be still be significant.

NOISE

The Retail Rich Alternative would have less residential units than the Proposed Project and additional retail, commercial and entertainment uses. The Retail Rich Alternative land uses could add additional noise sources and increase overall decibel levels within the Planning Area, and could also generate greater night time activity, due to increased entertainment uses. Additional development in the Planning Area could generate noise levels that reach decibel levels generating annoyance, hearing loss, speech

interference or physiological responses. The Proposed Project would generate noise levels about comfort levels along major road corridors, and has a land use pattern and policies that reduce noise levels to a level of less than significant. Because there is a greater potential for long-term noise impacts from the Retail Rich Alternative land uses, this alternative would have greater environmental impacts than the proposed CPGU but no significant impacts would occur.

Air Quality

Air quality within the Planning Area has the potential to decrease, as additional population and activity could generate pollutants and emissions into the Planning Area. The Proposed Project build-out is estimated to generate 2.32 tons/day of VOCs, 7.65 tons/day of NO_x, 11.47 tons/day of CO, 0.02 tons/day of SO_x, and 0.33 tons/day of $PM_{2.5}$, complying with regional air quality standards and generating no significant and unavoidable impacts.

The Retail Rich Alternative would reduce residential units and increase retail/commercial/entertainment density in districts and corridors in the Planning Area. Additionally, the development pattern under this alternative would have more segregated uses. This pattern would result in greater reliance on automobile trips and greater local congestion as the more segregated uses would be less conducive to walking, bicycling and transit. The greater amount of retail would also attract trips from nearby cities. Though additional local congestion would generate air pollutants from local sources, creating local air pollutants that would decrease respiratory health for community members, the overall population projects under the Retail Rich Alternative would have similar impacts to air quality as the CGPU and no significant impacts would be created.

Greenhouse Gases

The Planning Area emissions total for 2010 was 382,787Metric Tons of CO_2e. The Proposed Project also includes a Climate Action Plan and GHG emissions reducing policies. These combined efforts will help reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and comply with new legislation including California Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32). The Retail Rich Alternative would also contribute to increased GHG emissions. While residential emissions would decrease, nonresidential emissions would increase. Nonresidential uses tend to be more intense generators of GHG emissions and overall emissions would be expected to increase somewhat. Additionally, as the population would decrease, per capita emissions would increase, violating the SCAQMD per capita standards and resulting in a less than significant impact. Overall transportation emissions would likely be very similar. Because emissions would increase and per capita emissions would increase, impacts would be greater and a significant unavoidable impact would occur.

Population and Housing

The 2010 population for the Planning Area was 40,704, and 8,998 housing units. It is projected that the 2035 population of the Planning Area would reach 135,000 with 13,239 single family dwelling units, and 21,056 multiple family dwelling units under the Proposed Project. The Retail Rich Alternative would have 10,000 less residents, and 4,000 less housing units than the Proposed Project. While population would increase less with this alternative, impacts would be the same and no new significant impacts would occur.

Public Utilities

Public utilities within the Planning Area are made up of natural gas, electricity, telecommunications, solid waste, waste water, and water supply. The resource commitment to supply a mid-sized city with all utilities necessary to sustain a thriving community and economy, requires a large infrastructure and

energy commitment. The Retail Rich Alternative would create less population and housing in the Planning Area than the Proposed Project. The reduced footprint of housing units would help reduce impacts from public utilities infrastructure, but would also require additional infrastructure to supply the dense retail/commercial/entertainment corridor under the Retail Rich Alternative. Thus, impacts would be very similar under the Retail Rich Alternative and no new significant impacts would occur.

Public Services

Public Services within the Planning Area include law protection, fire protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities. The Planning Area's level of service for all public services currently operates below county standards. The Proposed Project proposes to reach and maintain level of service for all public services within the Planning Area. Though the development of additional public service facilities could generate negative environmental impacts, the Proposed Project contains policies that reduce impacts to less than significant.

The Retail Rich Alternative would generate a smaller population and a similar overall footprint as the Proposed Project. The Retail Rich Alternative would require similar facilities and public services resources to meet level of service standards and the reduced population may result in less pressure on open space resources. Additionally, the economic benefit of the Retail Rich Alternative would generate more money in the economy and provide greater resources for providing services. This alternative would not generate significant environmental impacts relative to public services. A reduced need for public service facilities, and the potential of economic prosperity of the Retail Rich Alternative, would have less environmental impacts from such facilities, than the Proposed Project.

Water Supply

Water supply for the Retail Rich Alternative includes water supply and wastewater. The Retail Rich Alternative would build the Planning Area with less housing and have a smaller population that the Proposed Project. The shift in retail, commercial, and entertainment uses would likely generate similar demand for water as expected under the CGPU. No significant impacts relative to water supply or wastewater would occur with this alternative. Thus, the alternative is not inferior or superior to the CGPU.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Implementation of the Retail Rich Alternative would fulfill most of the Proposed Project's objectives. The Retail Rich Alternative would not emphasize a walkable well-connected land use pattern, offer a greater variety of housing types to residents with varying incomes, increase housing diversity, or reduce GHG emissions, but the economic development would improve job opportunities, , . Additionally, the retail development anticipated under this alternative would likely take generations to realize as the alternative would need much more residential development throughout the Coachella Valley to be economically viable. Though the Retail Rich Alterative could generate more economic activity within the Planning Area, this alternative would result does not represent the most recent goals and vision of the Planning Area as decided by community members, stakeholders, and decision makers.

CONCLUSION

The Retail Rich Alternative results in greater environmental impacts in the following areas: land use and planning, noise, greenhouse gas emissions. Impacts relative to geology and seismic hazards, regional roadways, and water supply would be reduced. Additionally, the Retail Rich Alternative would result in

significant environmental impacts to aesthetics, agriculture, land use and planning, circulation, and greenhouse gases would be significant and unavoidable. Overall the Retail Rich Alternative would develop the Planning Area into a segregated land use pattern, with heavy emphasis on retail, commercial, and entertainment uses which would support a jobs-housing balance and increase jobs within the Planning Area. The Retail Rich Alternative would also reduce significant and unavoidable impacts from circulation, and regional congestion. Though the Retail Rich Alternative would create positive development outcomes for the Planning Area, the alternative does not meet all of the project objects, nor is the Retail Rich Alterative currently feasible in existing, or projected, market conditions. Additionally, the Retail Rich Alternative would create several additional significant impacts. For this reason, the alternative was rejected from consideration.

HOUSING RICH ALTERNATIVE

The Proposed Project focuses on a mixed housing development pattern with commercial, multi-family residential, and single family residential to be intertwined, and connected to other land uses. The Housing Rich Alternative would focus development on housing, and create more defined single-family residential neighborhoods, with commercial and multi-family residential being developed exclusively outside of neighborhoods along corridors. Non-residential development would be reduced. Compared with the proposed project, this alternative would add an additional 13,000 residents, increase dwelling units by 4,377, and decrease jobs by over 7,000. Additional housing alternative would allow more people to live within the Planning Area, or the Coachella Valley, and benefit from the amenities and unique atmosphere of Coachella and the SOI. Though additional housing offers potential residents a greater housing market to choose from, the shift in increased housing would decrease jobs within the Planning Area. This shift in the jobs-housing balance would increase the number of Coachella residents to seek jobs outside of the Planning Area. This alternative was selected because the City received feedback from a landowner stating that housing was the most viable development opportunity and that the City could not wait years for large scale retail development.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

AESTHETICS

Under the Housing Rich Alternative, the Planning Area would grow to 148,000 and increase the number of dwelling units. The Housing Rich Alternative would develop the Planning Area with a similar size footprint and locations of development as with the Proposed Project. As the overall development footprint would be very similar, the aesthetic impact of changing the Planning Area from a rural agricultural area to a midsize town would also be significant an unavoidable. Impacts relative to views and light and glare would largely be the same. Thus, aesthetic impacts would be very similar.

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture land, made up of farm land, prime farmland, and farmland of local importance, exists within the Planning Area, and provides an environmental benefit for local habitat, and economic benefits for local businesses through food and fiber production. The Housing Rich Alternative does not propose changes to agricultural resources and the overall footprint of development would be the same. A significant unavoidable impact would still occur to agriculture and impacts would be very similar.

Biological Resources

Under the Housing Rich Alternative, the additional growth projections would create similar risk and potential impacts to biological resources that exist within the Planning Area. Proposed policies and overall development footprint would be very similar, resulting in the same impacts to undeveloped land and the preservation of the same open space and habitat. Thus, no significant impacts would occur and impacts would be the same.

Cultural Resources

Under the Housing Rich Alternative, the additional growth projections would create similar risk and potential impacts to cultural resources that exist within the Planning Area. Proposed policies and overall development footprint would be very similar, resulting in the same impacts to undeveloped land and the preservation of the same open space. Thus, no significant impacts would occur and impacts would be the same.

Geology and Seismic Hazards

The Planning Area is subject to ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, and erosion, place development at risk for these geological hazards. The Housing Rich Alterative would develop the Planning Area to 148,000 resident, and place 4,377 more dwelling units than the Proposed Project. The additional growth under the Housing Rich Alterative would place more people and structures at risk of loss, injury, destruction, or death from geological and seismic hazards of the Planning Area. Based on the increased population growth, and increased population and structures as risk of geological and seismic hazards, the Housing Rich Alternative would have a slightly greater environmental impact than the Proposed Project but impacts would not be significant.

Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Project has potential to increase hazardous material within the Planning Area, through construction, industrial practices, or use of toxic substances. The Housing Rich Alternative also has the potential to increase hazardous materials. The growth under the Housing Rich Alternative is greater than the projections under the Proposed Project, and would increase potential for hazardous materials in the Planning Area. The Housing Rich Alternative could also increase the number of sensitive receptors exposed to hazardous materials in the Planning Area. Because the Housing Rich Alternative would both increase potential for hazardous materials, and increase populations that could be exposed, this alternative would have greater environmental impact than the Proposed Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Planning Area's sole water source comes from the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin, making up a portion of the Colorado River Basin, and is serviced by the Coachella Valley Water District. The Proposed Project projects population growth to reach 135,000 people by 2035. This population would create a demand 8,878 million gallons per day, creating potential water quality issues for the source, and output waterways within the Planning Area. Runoff and water quality issues from the Housing Rich Alternative would increase and be generated by the additional population projection, and amount of impervious surfaces from greater urban development footprint. Urban runoff, and water demands of the increased population could have greater impacts on the amount of clean water available to residents. Adequate clean water supply prevents certain populations from ingesting contaminated water supply, which could generate negative health impacts including disease and infection. Additional water quality issues from urban runoff could also generate negative impacts on biological resources, and waterways connected to the Planning Area. Based on these factors, the Housing Rich Alternative would have greater environmental impacts on hydrology and water quality, than the Proposed Project.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

The land use program under the Housing Rich Alternative would add more housing units, and would increase land allocated for residential development. The additional housing units and population in the Planning Area would grow under the same policies as proposed in the CGPU and would be required to adhere to any local, state, or federal regulations, plans, or programs. Additional population growth, under the Housing Rich Alternative, in the Planning Area may make it harder to achieve compliance with certain policies regarding air quality, and GHG emissions as the City would have a poorer jobs-housing balance and vehicle-related emissions and VMT would likely increase. No significant impacts would be expected and impacts would likely be similar.

CIRCULATION

The Proposed Project would generate additional traffic throughout the Planning Area, and has been determined to potentially generate significant and unavoidable impacts on regional road segments on SR86 and Interstate-10 passing through the northeastern portion of the Planning Area. The Housing Rich Alternative would continue to generate additional traffic, based on the 148,000 population projection. It is expected, that at full implementation of the Housing Rich Alternative, impacts to regional roadways would be greater as the Planning Area would generate a greater number of peak-hour trips that would be leaving the City for jobs in other cities. There would also be less use of alternative modes as the reduced mix of uses would discourage short trips that would be made by walking or bicycling. Additional congestion would equate to longer travel times, reducing the amount of leisure time for drivers, causing negative impacts on quality of life and health. Additionally, auto-oriented development would also support sedentary lifestyles, and increases potential for negative health impacts from inactivity including decrease in brain health, decrease in cardiovascular health, and weight gain. More drivers on the road would also contribute to higher potential for accident related injuries and death. Based on potential health impacts and the projected congestion from the Housing Rich Alternative would cause greater environmental impact than circulation under the Proposed Project.

NOISE

Additional development in the Planning Area could generate noise levels that reach decibel levels generating annoyance, hearing loss, speech interference or physiological responses. The Proposed Project would generate noise levels about comfort levels along major road corridors, and has a land use pattern and policies that reduce noise levels to a level of less than significant. The Housing Rich Alternative would increase temporary construction noise and long-term noise from population and housing projections. Additional housing and decreased commercial focus in the Planning Area could decrease overall noise nuisance and other impacts from higher decibel levels generated by retail, commercial, and entertainment uses. However, noise nuisance may increase for residential units located next to major roads leading in and out of residential neighborhoods, but reduce noise nuisance for homes located on the interior roads of residential neighborhoods. With increased regional traffic, noise impacts along arterials and regional roads could be greater. Thus, environmental impacts from noise would be less than those of the Proposed Project.

AIR QUALITY

Air quality within the Planning Area has the potential to decrease, as additional population and activity could generate pollutants and emissions into the Planning Area. The Proposed Project build-out is estimated to generate 2.32 tons/day of VOCs, 7.65 tons/day of NO_x, 11.47 tons/day of CO, 0.02 tons/day of SO_x, and 0.33 tons/day of $PM_{2.5}$, generating no Significant and Unavoidable impacts and complying with regional air quality standards. The Housing Rich Alterative would add more housing units and residents to the Planning Area than the Proposed Project, as well as a greater volume of regional

trips related to commuting to jobs outside of the City, thus creating additional sources of pollution that would hinder compliance with air quality standards. The additional air quality impacts would come from regional sources from additional trip to and from the City, and less emissions generated within the Planning Area. Despite reduction in local emissions, overall increase in air pollutants would have greater impacts on health, as poor air quality would contribute to issues on respiratory and cardiovascular health. Based on the population projections of the Housing Rich Alternative, environmental impacts on air quality would be greater than the Proposed Project, but impacts would not likely be significant and unavoidable.

Greenhouse Gases

The Planning Area emissions total for 2010 was 382,787Metric Tons of CO_2e. The Proposed Project also includes a Climate Action Plan, and GHG emissions reducing policies. These combined efforts will help reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and comply with new legislation including California Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32). The Housing Rich Alternative would increase population and housing which could increase GHG emissions related to transportation as more regional commuting would occur and there would be less reliance on alternative transportation modes. However, residential building stock tends to be less energy intensive than non-residential building stock. It would be more difficult to reduce emissions and the City would not likely meet its GHG future GHG targets. Additional GHG emissions would also contribute to impacts from climate change including increased temperature. Increased temperature in the Planning Area can increase risk of heath related impacts including heat stroke or death. Thus, impacts would be greater, with higher emissions due to increased transportation activity, creating a significant environmental impact.

Population and Housing

The 2010 population for the Planning Area was 40,704, and 8,998 housing units. It is projected that the 2035 population of the Planning Area would reach 135,000 with 13,239 single family dwelling units, and 21,056 multiple family dwelling units under the proposed project. The Housing Rich Alternative would develop the Planning Area to reach a projected population of 148,000, and 38,672 dwelling units. The additional development under the Housing Rich Alternative would not create impacts that would be much different to the Proposed Project, nor would any significant impacts occur.

Public Utilities

Public Utilities within the Planning Area are made up of natural gas, electricity, telecommunications, solid waste, waste water, and water supply. The resource commitment to supply a planned mid-sized city with all utilities necessary to sustain a thriving community and economy, requires a large infrastructure and energy commitment. The Housing Rich Alternative would also generate impacts on utilities infrastructure, as it would require additional facility to provide the level of service necessary to a population of 148,000. The higher population expectation under the Housing Rich Alternative would generate a greater need for utilities infrastructure with greater potential to cause negative environmental impacts. The additional funding for construction and maintenance of new infrastructure would pull public funding away from other programs that would include health and social services. The Housing Rich Alternative would development under the same level of service ratios, and have additional population to service, thus generating slightly greater environmental impact than the Proposed Project, but no significant impacts would occur.

Public Services

Public Services within the Planning Area include law protection, fire protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities. The Planning Area's level of service for all public services currently operates

below county standards. The Proposed Project proposes to reach and maintain level of service for all public services within the Planning Area. Though the development of additional public service facilities could generate negative environmental impacts, the Proposed Project contains policies that reduce impacts to less than significant. The Housing Rich Alternative would place greater demand on service providers to increase service to meet the population growth. The development of additional facilities for public services would have slightly greater environmental impact under the Housing Rich Alternative. However, no significant impacts would occur.

WATER SUPPLY

As discussed in Section 4.16, the Planning Area's ground water basin water source would have enough water supply to support the projected population under the Proposed Project. The Housing Rich Alternative is projected to grow the Planning Area to a population of 148,000 requiring more water supply to meet the growth in demand than the Proposed Project would generate. Additional water demand would generate more need for ground water recharge, higher potential for overdraft of the existing water supply, potential for ground water contamination, increase salt concentration from lower water table levels, and health impacts from contaminated water or lower water supply. Based on the population projections of the Proposed Project and the Housing Rich Alternative would have greater environmental impacts, but no significant impacts are expected.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Implementation of the Housing Rich Alternative would fulfill many of the objectives of the Proposed Project. The Housing Rich Alternative would somewhat meet changing demographics and create a vision for the City. It would create a more connected city, create a city with a range of housing options, improve living conditions and update older development plans to meet the City's vision. It would be less effective at creating a healthy and economically viable City as there would be fewer opportunities for active transportation, less tax revenue, and fewer jobs. It would also be less effective at reducing GHG emissions and would likely fail to meet GHG reduction targets. However the Housing Rich Alternative would increase population and increase environmental impacts that the Proposed Project aims to prevent. Additionally, the Housing Rich Alternative would generate greater air pollution and GHG emissions, increase traffic congestion, and would not support a jobs housing balance.

CONCLUSION

The Housing Rich Alternative would result in similar impacts to aesthetics, agriculture biological resources, cultural resources, hazards, hazardous materials, and hydrology and water quality. Impacts related to geology and seismic, land use and planning, circulation, air quality, greenhouse gases, public utilities, public services, and supply water would be greater. No significant impacts of the Proposed Project would be avoided and significant impacts would still occur relative to aesthetics, agriculture, greenhouse gases, and circulation. The Housing Rich Alternative also fails to meet all of the Project Objectives. For this reason, the alternative has been rejected.

CONVENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN ALTERNATIVE

The Proposed Project proposes to develop the Planning Area with greater street connectivity, mixed land uses, and closer distances between residential and commercial/retail/civic uses. Additionally, compared to the Proposed Project, the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would have the same projected population, housing units, and jobs but replace the highly connected pattern of the Proposed Project with a more auto oriented development pattern that would include characteristics such as: separated land uses, wide streets, low intersection density, auto-oriented buildings with large set blocks and road-fronting parking lots, residential neighborhoods separated from other land uses, cul-de-sacs, and disconnected street pattern. This pattern alternative would be in-line with previous development patterns, and has been built in most areas throughout the region. This pattern creates a quiet environment for residential activities to occur in the privacy of each neighborhood, and reduce potential conflicts of residential closely located to commercial, including crime, noise, high levels of non-residential traffic, and air quality.

However, separation of housing, commercial, business, retail, and civic uses creates a street pattern that reduces potential for pedestrians and cyclists to easily and quickly connect to other land uses. The separation also incentivizes the need for vehicle use as non-residential land uses could be located out of comfortable walking or cycling proximity, which could increase vehicle emissions, decrease healthy activities for residents, and create additional traffic volumes within the Planning Area. Conventional development patterns could also prevent certain populations, including young and elderly residents, from accessing civic, commercial, and retail activity, as they may not be able to use a car to move around the Planning Area. Though the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative could create a perceived predictable urban scape, it would could have potential environmental and social impacts for residents within the Planning Area.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

AESTHETICS

The Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would develop the Planning Area with the same population and housing units as the Proposed Project. Development would occur in the same locations, but in a different form. Thus, the visual character of the Planning Area, views of scenic resources, and light and glare impacts would all be the same. A significant impact relative to visual character would also still occur.

AGRICULTURE

Under the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative the housing footprint will grow the Planning Area to a population of 135,000 living in conventional single family housing tracts, and separated land uses. The Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would develop the Planning Area to the same population and affect the same lands as the Proposed Project, resulting in the same loss of agricultural resources. Thus impacts would be the same and the Convention Development Pattern Alternative would still create a significant impact to agricultural resources.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Under the Conventional Development Pattern Alterative, the additional growth projections would create similar risk and potential impacts to biological resources that exist within the Planning Area. Proposed

policies and overall development footprint would be very similar, resulting in the same impacts to undeveloped land and the preservation of the same open space and habitat. Thus, no significant impacts would occur and impacts would be the same.

Cultural Resources

Under the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative, the additional growth projections would create similar risk and potential impacts to cultural resources that exist within the Planning Area. Proposed policies and overall development footprint would be very similar, resulting in the same impacts to undeveloped land and the preservation of the same open space. Thus, no significant impacts would occur and impacts would be the same.

Geology and Seismic Hazards

The Planning Area is subject to ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, and erosion, place development at risk for these geological hazards. The Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would develop the Planning Area with the same number of people and dwelling units as the Proposed Project. The same policies for reducing or avoiding potential impacts would apply. Thus, impacts would be the same under both alternatives and no significant impacts would occur.

Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Project has potential to increase hazardous material within the Planning Area, through construction, industrial practices, or use of toxic substances. The Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would also potentially add hazardous materials, expose sensitive receptors to hazardous materials, and generate the transportation of hazardous materials through the Planning Area. Because the population and housing projection are similar under the Proposed Project and Conventional Development Pattern Alternative, there is similar risk associated with the exposure to hazardous materials. Based on population similarities, the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would have similar environmental impacts as the Proposed Project and so significant impacts would occur.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Planning Area's sole water source comes from the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin, making up a portion of the Colorado River Basin, and is serviced by the Coachella Valley Water District. The Proposed Project projects population growth to reach 135,000 people by 2035. The Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would develop the Planning Area with the same population, but with conventional auto-oriented land use patterns with sprawling development and land uses that have the potential to increase water demands for additional residential lawns and city-wide landscaped that would be utilized in conventional land use patterns. The greater reliance on automobiles under Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would likely generate a need for a greater area of roadways and parking lots, which would generate potential additional impacts on water quality and hydrology from an increase in urban runoff from increasing the area of impervious surfaces. Thus, the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would have slightly more environmental impacts on the Planning Area, than the Proposed Project.

Land Use and Planning

The land use pattern of the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would develop the Planning Area using auto-oriented land use patterns. These land use patterns segregate land use, divide residential and commercial uses, decrease street connectivity and walkability with large blocks and cul-de-sacs, and build an automobile-dependent environment. The Conventional Development Pattern would

also disincentive walking and bicycling from the disconnected street pattern and separated land uses. Inactivity for community residents would contribute to negative health impacts from sedentary lifestyles brought out by auto-oriented development, that include poor muscular strength, poor cardiovascular health, and weight gain. The Proposed Project allows for a varied mix of land uses to promote connectivity and walkability for residents and patrons. Under the Conventional Growth Alternative, more driving would be expected and more vehicle miles traveled would be generated. These effects would inhibit the City's ability to meet the GHG and VMT reduction targets of AB 32 and SB 375, respectively. Additionally, there would likely be increased noise and air pollution and reduced public health benefits resulting from an increase in driving. Based on the traditional land use pattern, the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would have greater impacts relative to land use and planning and a significant impact would occur due to an inability to comply with AB 32 and SB 375 goals.

CIRCULATION

The Proposed Project would generate additional traffic throughout the Planning Area, and has been determined to potentially generate significant and unavoidable impacts on regional road segments on SR86 and Interstate-10 passing through the northeastern portion of the Planning Area. The Conventional Planning Alternative would create additional traffic through the Planning Area as auto-oriented development generates greater VMT per capita. The additional VMT projected under the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would add congestion and more vehicles to the Planning Area, increase potential for auto-related accidents, and reduce the use of alternative transportation modes. In turn, this would decrease physical activity, and increase air pollution, both of which have negative effects on public health. Based on the traditional land use pattern that would develop the Planning Area into an auto-dependent city, the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would have a greater environmental impact on circulation and a significant unavoidable impact would still occur.

NOISE

Additional development in the Planning Area could generate noise levels that reach decibel levels generating annoyance, hearing loss, speech interference or physiological responses. The Proposed Project would generate noise levels about comfort levels along major road corridors, and has a land use pattern and policies that reduce noise levels to a level of less than significant. The Conventional Planning Alternative would also contribute to noise levels and could generate additional noise levels from the higher VMTs expected per resident. The additional noise generated from additional VMTs under the Conventional Planning Alternative would have greater environmental impact that is expected under the Proposed Project, but no significant impacts would be created.

AIR QUALITY

Air quality within the Planning Area would increase under the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative, as the development pattern would lead to more driving and more emissions. The Proposed Project build-out is estimated to generate 2.32 tons/day of VOCs, 7.65 tons/day of NO_x, 11.47 tons/day of CO, 0.02 tons/day of SO_x, and 0.33 tons/day of $PM_{2.5}$, generating no Significant and Unavoidable impacts and complying with regional air quality standards. The Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would develop the Planning Area with conventional land use patterns and disconnected street connectivity that would lead to more driving within the Planning Area. The additional vehicle emissions and could decrease air quality, violate air quality standards, or create additional barriers to comply with updated regulations including AB 32 and SB 375. Exceeding air quality standards and increasing air pollutants in the Planning Area would generate health impacts on

respiratory and cardiovascular health. Thus, the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would have greater environmental impacts than the Proposed Project.

GREENHOUSE GASES

The Planning Area emissions total for 2010 was 382,787Metric Tons of CO_2e. The Proposed Project also includes a Climate Action Plan, and GHG emissions reducing policies. These combined efforts will help reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and comply with new legislation including California Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32). The Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would rely on the same framework for reducing GHG emissions, but would generate greater levels of traffic due to the disconnected development pattern and would not be able to take advantage of the GHG reduction benefits of the highly connected development pattern of the Proposed Project which reduces automobile use. Added GHG emissions would increase climate change impacts including temperature increases within the Planning Area. Health impacts from increased temperature include heat strokes, dehydration, and death. The increased GHG emission levels from transportation activities would likely exceed the City's GHG reduction target for 2020 and would have a greater impact on atmospheric concentrations of CO_2e, and have greater environmental impact than the Proposed Project, creating a significant impact.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The 2010 population for the Planning Area was 40,704, and 8,998 housing units. It is projected that the 2035 population of the Planning Area would reach 135,000 with 13,239 single family dwelling units, and 21,056 multiple family dwelling units under the proposed project. The Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would continue to develop the Planning Area with the same growth but with a different development pattern. The similarities in population and housing projections would result in the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative to have similar environmental impacts on Population and Housing.

PUBLIC UTILITIES

Public Utilities within the Planning Area are made up of natural gas, electricity, telecommunications, solid waste, waste water, and water supply. The resource commitment to supply a planned mid-sized city with all utilities necessary to sustain a thriving community and economy, requires a large infrastructure and energy commitment. The Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would also generate a new demand on utilities infrastructure, as it would require the same level of service to meet the same population and housing projections. Thus, impacts would be the same and no significant impacts would occur.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Public Services within the Planning Area include law protection, fire protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities. The Planning Area's level of service for all public services currently operates below county standards. The Proposed Project proposes to reach and maintain level of service for all public services within the Planning Area. Though the development of additional public service facilities could generate negative environmental impacts, the Proposed Project contains policies that reduce impacts to less than significant. The Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would grow the Planning Area with a population to the same population size and would require the same amount of facilities to meet the level of service in the Planning Area, as the Proposed Project.

Additionally, the disconnected street pattern of the Conventional Development Alternative would decrease access to parks, health facilities, and social service facilities that would all benefit health of

community members, as well as decrease response times for fire, police, and emergency vehicles due to longer travel time. Based on the same population projects, the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would have the same environmental impact, but decreased public health benefits. No significant impacts would occur.

WATER SUPPLY

Water supply impacts from the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative include water supply and wastewater. The Proposed Project projects population growth to reach 135,000 people by 2035. This population would create a demand 8,878 million gallons per day, creating potential water quality issues for the source, and output waterways within the Planning Area. As discussed in Section 4.7, the Planning Area's ground water basin water source would have enough water supply to support the projected population under the Proposed Project. The Conventional Development Pattern would have the same population and housing projections as the Proposed Project, and would have similar water demands and waste water outputs as the Proposed Project. Thus, the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would have the same environmental impacts as the Proposed Project.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Implementation of the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would not fulfill all of the project's objectives. The Convention Pattern Alternative would not support well-connected land use patterns, implement the most recent innovations in infrastructure, social services and environmental sustainability, or provide adaptable land-use designations or strategies to adapt to demographic changes, or any unforeseen changes in the economic market. Additionally, the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would not result in the update of older, outdated development plans, reduce community greenhouse gas emissions, of foster the community's desire for safe, active transportation. Though the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative could handle the expected population growth, the development pattern is not in-line with the community's vision of a highly walkable community.

CONCLUSION

The Conventional Development Pattern Alternative results in similar environmental impacts to the following areas: aesthetics, agriculture, biological resources, cultural resources, geological and seismic hazards, hazardous materials, noise, public utilities, population and housing, public services, and water supply. Impacts would greater relative to hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, circulation, air quality, and greenhouse gases. Impacts relative to aesthetics, agriculture, land use and planning, circulation, and greenhouse gases would result in significant unavoidable impacts. Overall, the Conventional Development Pattern Alterative would continue to develop the Planning Area under an older model of community design, with less focus on creating of sustainable, thriving, and economically sound community. The Proposed Project provides a mix of uses throughout the Planning Area, and follows community goals of a more walkable city with easy access to retail, commercial, schools, and open space. Because the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative creates additional significant impacts and does not meet all project objectives, it has been rejected from consideration.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Based on alternative analysis of the Proposed Project, the Retail/Entertainment/Commercial Rich Alternative would be the environmental superior alternative. The Retail Rich Alternative's reduced population size and housing units, increased economic opportunity, and greatest number of similar or reduced environmental impacts than the Proposed Project, leads it to be environmental superior. The Retail Rich Alternative has the potential to have slightly less environmental impacts than the Proposed Project. This alternative would also reduce significant unavoidable environmental impacts from regional circulation that would be created by the Proposed Project. However, the Retail Rich Alternative would provide less housing and less effectively meet the objective to create a wide variety of housing opportunities. While this alternative would reduce the impacts to regional roadways from congestion, the reduced jobs-housing balance of this alternative and the greater emphasis on nonresidential development would result in significant impacts to land use and planning and greenhouse gases due to increased energy use and greenhouse gas emissions and exceeding AB 32 and SB 375 goals. Additionally, the retail development anticipated under this alternative would likely take generations to realize as the alternative would need much more residential development in the valley to be economically viable.