

5.1 CEQA REQUIREMENTS

CEQA requires that an EIR analyze a reasonable range of feasible alternatives that meet most or all project objectives while reducing or avoiding one or more significant environmental effects of the project. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires an EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]). Where a potential alternative was examined but not chosen as one of the range of alternatives, the CEQA Guidelines require that the EIR briefly discuss the reasons the alternative was dismissed.

Alternatives that are evaluated in the EIR must be potentially feasible alternatives. However, not all possible alternatives need to be analyzed. An EIR must “set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(f).) The CEQA Guidelines provide a definition for a “range of reasonable alternatives” and, thus limit the number and type of alternatives that need to be evaluated in an EIR.

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

... capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors. (CEQA Guidelines 15364)

The inclusion of an alternative in an EIR is not evidence that it is feasible as a matter of law, but rather reflects the judgment of lead agency staff that the alternative is potentially feasible. The final determination of feasibility will be made by the lead agency decision-making body through the adoption of CEQA Findings at the time of action on the Project. (Mira Mar Mobile Community v. City of Oceanside (2004) 119 Cal.App.4th 477, 489 see also CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15091(a) (3)(findings requirement, where alternatives can be rejected as infeasible); 15126.6 ([an EIR] must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation”). The following factors may be taken into consideration in the assessment of the feasibility of alternatives: site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plan or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and the ability of the proponent to attain site control (Section 15126.6 (f) (1)).

Equally important to attaining the project objectives is the reduction of some or all significant impacts, particularly those that could not be mitigated to a less than significant level. The following significant and unavoidable impacts of the West Davis Active Adult Community Project are discussed in Sections 3.1 through 3.15 (project-level) and Chapter 4.0 (cumulative-level):

- Impact 3.1-1: Potential to result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas and resources or substantial degradation of visual character

5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

- Impact 3.2-1: Project implementation may result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses
- Impact 3.2-4: Project implementation may lead to the indirect conversion of adjacent agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses
- Impact 3.3-1: Project operations have the potential to cause a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation
- Impact 3.14-5: Under cumulative plus project conditions, project implementation would cause significant impacts at study intersections
- Impact 3.14-6: Under cumulative plus project conditions, project implementation would cause significant impacts at study freeway facilities
- Impact 3.14-9: The proposed site plan would not provide adequate emergency vehicle access
- Impact 3.14-10: The proposed site plan would not provide adequate project access
- Impact 4.1: The project may contribute to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character of the region
- Impact 4.2: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on agricultural land and uses
- Impact 4.3: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on the region's air quality
- Impact 4.15: Under cumulative plus project conditions, project implementation would cause significant impacts at study intersections
- Impact 4.16: Under cumulative plus project conditions, project implementation would cause significant impacts at study freeway facilities

The following analysis of alternatives focuses on significant impacts, including both those that can be mitigated to a less than significant level and those that would remain significant even if mitigation is applied or for which no feasible mitigation is available.

A Notice of Preparation was circulated to the public to solicit recommendations for a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project. Additionally, a public scoping meeting was held during the public review period to solicit recommendations for a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project. The following comments were received related to potential alternatives to the project to be addressed in the EIR:

- Toni Terhaar and Russ Kanz (April 26, 2017): Suggested development of the project as an affordable housing project, instead of a senior community.
- Toni Terhaar and Russ Kanz (May 4, 2017): Suggested consideration of a range of alternatives to the project, such as a non-age restricted alternative.
- Greg Rowe (May 11, 2017): Suggested development of two alternatives: a Binning Ranch alternative, and a higher density alternative.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The alternatives to the proposed project selected for analysis in the EIR were developed to minimize significant environmental impacts while fulfilling the basic objectives of the project. As described in Chapter 2.0, Project Description, the following objectives have been identified for the West Davis Active Adult Community Project:

- Create a community that connects the City’s senior population to existing services and facilities in West Davis.
 - Design a neighborhood with homes to support an active lifestyle for older adults.
 - Create a diverse community that provides housing for multiple generations and lifestyles by including a provision in the single-family neighborhood for 20% non-age restricted housing.
 - Provide Davis residents with housing options that meets their long-term needs so they remain local rather than leave the City.
1. Provide a community that is not isolated from the rest of the City by providing public gathering spaces for all City residents.

5.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THIS EIR

Four alternatives to the proposed project were developed based on City of Davis staff and City Council input, input from the public during the NOP review period, and the technical analysis performed to identify the environmental effects of the proposed project. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR include the following four alternatives in addition to the proposed West Davis Active Adult Community Project:

- No Project (No Build) Alternative
- Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative
- Higher Density, Less Land Alternative
- Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative

NO PROJECT (NO BUILD) ALTERNATIVE

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6[e]) require consideration of a No Project Alternative that represents the existing conditions, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved. For purposes of this analysis, the No Project (No Build) Alternative assumes that the project site remains in its existing state and no additional development would occur. The current condition of the site consists of agricultural uses, a gravel parking lot, and the existing Covell Boulevard improvements and drainage channel. It is noted that the No Project (No Build) Alternative would fail to meet the project objectives identified by the City of Davis.

CONVENTIONAL (NON-AGE RESTRICTED) ALTERNATIVE

Under the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative, the project site would be developed similar to the proposed project with up to 560 units, but the units would not be age-restricted.

5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The required affordable housing component would be provided on-site under this alternative, similar to the proposed project. The proposed amenities, mixed use area, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and landscaping would be the same as the proposed project.

HIGHER DENSITY, LESS LAND ALTERNATIVE

Under the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative, the project site would be developed with the same number of dwelling units as the proposed project (up to 560), but on a smaller footprint than the proposed project. This alternative would include development of approximately fifty percent of the footprint of the proposed project site, or approximately 37 acres. This alternative would result in a density of approximately 15.1 units per acre. The assumed type of units would be adjusted to reflect the increased density. The increased density under this alternative would allow a portion of the required agricultural land mitigation area and stormwater detention facilities to be located on the project site. The proposed amenities, mixed use area, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and landscaping would be the same as the proposed project.

OFF-SITE (INSIDE MACE CURVE) ALTERNATIVE

Under the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative, the proposed project would be developed with a decrease in units at an off-site location. Parcels of similar size that are designated and/or zoned for residential uses are not currently available for development within the City. For the purposes of evaluating an off-site alternative location within the City, City staff has identified the 47-acre property located inside the Mace Curve, adjacent to Harper Junior High School. The off-site location is designated Agriculture by the Yolo County General Plan land use map has a County zoning of Agriculture-Extensive (A-N). Similar to the proposed project site, development of this off-site location would require a Measure R vote. This site was identified as a “yellow light” site in the 2008 Resolution by City Council implementing the Housing Element Steering Committee recommendations. The 2008 Resolution noted that this off-site location could support 350 to 473 dwelling units.

The overall proposed project density of approximately 7.6 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) ($560 \text{ du} \div 74 \text{ ac} = 7.57 \text{ du/ac}$). Utilizing this density of 7.6 du/ac, the approximately 47-acre off-site location would provide up to 360 units ($360 \text{ du} \div 47 \text{ ac} = 7.55 \text{ du/ac}$). The proposed amenities, mixed use area, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and landscaping would be the same as the proposed project.

5.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The alternatives analysis provides a summary of the relative impact level of significance associated with each alternative for each of the environmental issue areas analyzed in this EIR. Following the analysis of each alternative, Table 5.0-1 summarizes the comparative effects of each alternative.

NO PROJECT (NO BUILD) ALTERNATIVE

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would leave the project site in its existing state and would not result in increases in daytime glare or nighttime lighting. The visual character of the project site would not change under this alternative compared to existing conditions.

As described in Section 3.1, the visual character of the project site would be significantly altered as a result of project implementation. Compliance with the City's site plan and architectural approval process and consistency with the General Plan and the Davis Zoning Ordinance would ensure that impacts are reduced to the greatest extent possible. Nevertheless, impacts related to degradation of the visual character of the site would be significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of the lighting plan required by Mitigation Measure 3.1-1 would ensure that lighting features do not result in light spillage onto adjacent properties and do not significantly impact views of the night sky. Adherence to the mitigation measure would ensure that excessively reflective building materials are not used, and that the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to daytime glare. As such, impacts related to nighttime lighting and daytime glare would be less than significant with mitigation.

In summary, the proposed project would result in potentially significant new sources of light and glare. The proposed project would also result in impacts to the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings. However, the No Project (No Build) Alternative would avoid these impacts altogether. As such, this impact would be reduced when compared to the proposed project.

Agricultural Resources

The majority of the project site was previously used for agricultural purposes, and the project site is zoned for agricultural uses by the Yolo County zoning code. The No Project (No Build) Alternative would result in no development in on the project site. As such, this alternative would have no impact on agricultural land, no potential for conflicts with existing agricultural resources, and no potential for conflict with regulations and plans intended to protect those resources. As such, this impact would be reduced when compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality

As described in Section 3.2, and shown in Table 3.2-7, operation of the unmitigated proposed project would result in a significant impact associated with respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀) and reactive organic gasses (ROG). With incorporation of the mitigation described in Section 3.2, the proposed project would generate significant operational air quality impacts. Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the project site would not be developed, and there would be no net change in emissions and no potential for a conflict with any adopted plans or policies related to air quality. As such, this impact would be reduced when compared to the proposed project.

While the proposed project would result in less than significant construction emissions impacts after mitigation, under this alternative, no construction emissions would be generated. Therefore, this impact is avoided under this alternative. The No Project (No Build) Alternative would reduce air quality impacts as compared with the proposed project, and therefore have less of an impact than the proposed project on air quality.

Biological Resources

As described in Section 3.3, while project implementation is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to biological resources, construction activities would result in tree removal and ground disturbing activities that may impact or harm biological resources, including special-status bird species. Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed, no habitat would be removed, and no ground disturbing activities would occur. As such, this impact would be reduced when compared to the proposed project.

Cultural and Tribal Resources

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not result in ground disturbing activities and would reduce the potential to disturb or destroy cultural, tribal, historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources. While the proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to cultural or historical resources, the No Project (No Build) Alternative would further reduce the risk of the unintentionally discovery of such resources.

Geology and Soils

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would result in the project site remaining in its existing condition. The current condition of the site consists of agricultural uses, a gravel parking lot, and the existing Covell Boulevard improvements and drainage channel. There are currently no structures on the project site that are subject to seismic or geologic risks, including earthquakes, liquefaction, subsidence, etc. The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not involve new construction that could be subject to seismic, geologic or soils hazards, thus this alternative would have no potential for impact. As such, this impact would be reduced when compared to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change, and Energy

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the project site would not be developed, and there would be no net change in emissions and no potential for a conflict with any adopted plans or policies related to greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions. Development of the project site under this alternative would not provide for a development that is consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG's) Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). Additionally, the proposed project assists with local GHG reduction efforts by providing a residential project that meets the GHG reduction requirements set forth in the City's Staff Report on GHG Thresholds and Standards for New Residential Development, based on the project density and proximity to transit. As described in Section 3.6, the proposed project is consistent with the City of Davis

Climate Action and Adaptation Plan. Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the site would not be developed, and there would be no potential for the project to conflict with any adopted plans or policies related to GHG reductions. Overall, impacts related to greenhouse gases, climate change, and energy would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, no new land uses would be introduced to the project site, and the potential for hazardous material release on the project site would be eliminated. As described in Section 3.7, construction activities may result in the use and transport of common hazardous materials, including oils, fuels, paints, and solvents. This potential impact would be eliminated under the No Project (No Build) Alternative. Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, a new land use would be introduced to the site, and the potential for future residents to be exposed to contamination on the site would be eliminated. This impact, though less than significant with implementation of mitigation, would be avoided under the No Project (No Build) Alternative.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, potential water quality impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project would be eliminated. While groundwater recharge is not considered a significant impact under the proposed project, under this alternative, the land will be kept in its present state with the majority of the project site containing permeable surfaces. The majority of project site has soils all have a hydrologic rating of “C”, which is indicative of soils having a low infiltration rate (high runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. The pescadero and willows soils have a hydrologic rating of “D”, which is indicative of soils having an even lower low infiltration rate (high runoff potential). The project site is not a major source of groundwater recharge due to the lack of precipitation and the absence of a major water source. The No Project (No Build) Alternative will have a greater chance of groundwater recharge because it does not introduce large areas of impervious surfaces as would the proposed project. As such, potential impacts related to groundwater recharge would be reduced under the No Project (No Build) Alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Stormwater from the proposed project buildings and site would flow into the proposed greenway swales, perimeter drainage channel, and offsite detention basin. In order to meet the guidelines and requirements set forth in the “Phase II Small MS4 General Permit, 2013-0001-DWQ,” dated February 5, 2013, adopted by the City of Davis, permanent storm water control measures are proposed to be incorporated into the project in order to mitigate the impacts of pollutants in storm water runoff from the proposed project. Because project improvements would manage and treat stormwater flows from the site, it would represent an improvement to water quality over the No Project (No Build) Alternative.

As described in Section 3.9, when the proposed project is developed, the on-site impervious area would increase, leading to faster runoff rates. Thus, the proposed project would provide more impervious surface on-site as compared to the No Project (No Build) Alternative, which

would also result in an increase in rainfall infiltration, and a reduction in runoff during storm events.

As described in Section 3.0, project implementation has the potential to result in the discharge of pollutants into on-site detention basins and storm drains, and would change the existing drainage pattern on the site, although these impacts are less than significant as a result of project design and applied mitigation measures. Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, these potential impacts would be eliminated. Overall, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be reduced under the No Project (No Build) Alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Land Use

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not require a change of the project site's General Plan Land Use designation from Agriculture to Residential – Medium Density, Residential – High Density, Residential Greenspace Overlay, Urban Agriculture Transition Area, and Mixed Use. While the proposed project would provide significant affordable, age-restricted, and non-age restricted housing within the City of Davis, the No Project (No Build) Alternative would maintain this site in its current state with no new construction or significant housing. Maintenance of the site for potential future agricultural uses would be consistent with the existing land use and zoning designations for the site. While the analysis in Section 3.10 concluded that the proposed project would not result in any significant land use impacts, the No Build Alternative would not improve conditions on the subject property or devote it to a productive use, and therefore, would have adverse impacts compared to the proposed project.

Noise and Vibration

As described in Section 3.10, implementation of the proposed project would result in increased transportation and stationary source noise levels. Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the project site would not be developed and there would be no potential for new noise sources. Construction noise and vibration would not occur under this alternative. This would result in a reduction of noise from on-site construction activities at existing sensitive receptors. Additionally, operational noise resulting from the proposed residences, health club, restaurant, and park areas would be eliminated under the No Project (No Build) Alternative. Therefore, impacts related to noise and vibration would be reduced under this alternative.

Population and Housing

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the proposed project would not be developed and additional housing sites within the City of Davis would not be provided. This alternative would not assist the City in providing additional housing sites for residents, including seniors and low-income residents. Additionally, as described in Section 3.12, project implementation would result in a maximum population of approximately 1,467 residents to the City. The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not result in development of housing which could increase the

population. Overall, under this alternative, the proposed project would have similar impacts as the No Project (No Build) Alternative.

Public Services and Recreation

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the project site would remain undeveloped and there would be no increased demand for public services or recreation. The recreational amenities within the proposed project, however, would not be developed for community use. The No Project (No Build) Alternative would have a reduced impact when compared to the proposed project because demand on public services would be reduced with compared to the proposed project, with the possible exception of recreational park facilities.

Transportation and Circulation

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not introduce additional vehicle trips onto the study area roadways. It was determined that the proposed project would cause an increase in traffic on roadways or intersections that would cause traffic operations to degrade to an unacceptable level of service. Mitigation was identified to alleviate some impacts; however, certain impacts were deemed to be significant and unavoidable. Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, these potential impacts would be avoided, and the No Project (No Build) Alternative would have a reduced traffic impact when compared to the proposed Project.

Utilities

Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased flows to the public wastewater system. The wastewater system is capable of handling the increased flows with their existing permit and infrastructure.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased demand for potable water. The City has adequate water supply to handle the increased demand with their existing supply and infrastructure.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased storm drainage from new impervious surfaces. The proposed project includes a storm drainage collection system to handle the increased storm drainage.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased generation of solid waste. However, the landfill has adequate capacity to dispose the solid waste.

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative the project site would not increase the demand for any utilities, including wastewater services, potable water supplies, or solid waste disposal. There would be no need to construct stormwater drainage infrastructure. Overall, the demand for utilities would be reduced under the No Project (No Build) Alternative when compared to the proposed project.

CONVENTIONAL (NON-AGE RESTRICTED) ALTERNATIVE

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would result in the construction of up to 560 units. However, under this alternative, the units would not be age-restricted. When compared to the proposed project, approximately the same area of the project site would be developed with residential uses. Developing the entire project site with an increase in residential units would likely result in buildings with equal stories as the proposed project. Additionally, the building setbacks from Covell Boulevard under this alternative would likely be similar to the proposed project, which would equally impact the visual and aesthetic appeal of the site compared to the proposed project. Overall, this alternative would have equal impacts to aesthetics when compared to the proposed project.

Agricultural Resources

This alternative would result in the construction of the same number of housing units and the same area of mixed uses as the proposed project. However, under this alternative, the residential units would not be age-restricted. Because the same site and site area as the proposed project would be developed under this alternative, impacts related to land use conflicts and conversion of farmland to urban uses would be identical to the proposed project. Given the loss of active agricultural land that would occur under this alternative, this alternative would have equal impacts to agricultural resources as the proposed project.

Air Quality

As described in Section 3.2, implementation of the proposed project would generate emissions during both the construction phase and the operational phase. Construction related impacts would be similar under this alternative when compared to the proposed project, as the area of ground disturbance would be comparable, and the duration of construction would be comparable. However, under this alternative, mobile source emissions would increase. Mobile source (vehicle emissions) are directly related to the number of vehicle trips generated by a project. Under this alternative, the non-age restricted residential uses developed on the project site would generate more daily vehicle trips when compared to the proposed project, which would generate higher levels of pollutants from mobile sources. Therefore, this alternative would have greater impacts related to air quality when compared to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Potential impacts to biological resources are primarily related to the area proposed for disturbance and less on the type of urban uses that would occur on the project site. Under this alternative, a similar amount of the project site would be disturbed when compared to the proposed project, and the potential for impacts to biological resources would remain unchanged when compared to the proposed project.

Cultural and Tribal Resources

Potential impacts to cultural resources are primarily related to the area proposed for disturbance and less to the type of urban uses that would occur on the project site. Under this alternative, a similar amount of the project site would be disturbed when compared to the proposed project, and the potential for impacts to cultural resources would remain unchanged when compared to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

This alternative would result in the construction of the same number of housing units as the proposed project over approximately the same area as the proposed project. These buildings and structures would be exposed to the same level of risk from geologic hazards as the proposed project. However, as discussed further below, the number of residents resulting from this alternative would increase compared to the proposed project. Because more residents would be located on the project site under the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative, more residents would be exposed to the risks from geologic hazards as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this impact would be slightly increased under this alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change, and Energy

This alternative would result in the construction of the same amount of housing units as compared to the proposed project over approximately the same area as the proposed project, but the units would not be age-restricted. Development of the project site under this alternative would provide for a development that is consistent with SACOG's SCS. Similar to the proposed project, the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would assist with regional GHG reduction efforts by providing a residential project at a density level that meets the SCS goals. Additionally, as described above, this alternative would result in greater daily vehicle trips when compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this impact would be slightly greater under this alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative is similar to the proposed project, but would increase the number of residents residing within the project site. As described in Section 3.8, construction activities may result in the use and transport of common hazardous materials, including oils, fuels, paints and solvents. This potential impact would still occur under the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative. Additionally, the operational phases of both the proposed project and the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. This impact would be similar under this alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative a similar amount of land would be covered with impervious surfaces compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, stormwater from the buildings and site would flow into the greenway swales, perimeter drainage channel, and offsite detention basin. In order to meet the guidelines and requirements set forth in the “Phase II Small MS4 General Permit, 2013-0001-DWQ,” dated February 5, 2013, the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would be required to develop permanent storm water control measures and incorporate these measures into the alternative in order to mitigate the impacts of pollutants in storm water runoff from the alternative. Because the alternative would be required to implement improvements in order to manage and treat stormwater flows from the site, impacts related to water quality would be similar.

As described in Section 3.9, when the proposed project is developed, the on-site impervious area would increase, leading to faster runoff rates. The Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would provide a similar amount of impervious surface on-site as compared to the proposed project, which would also result in similar impacts related to rainfall infiltration and runoff during storm events as compared to the proposed project.

As described in Section 3.9, project implementation has the potential to result in the discharge of pollutants into on-site detention basins and storm drains, and would change the existing drainage pattern on the site, although these impacts are less than significant as a result of project design and applied mitigation measures. Under the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative, these potential impacts would be similar as the project. Overall, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be similar under the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Land Use

Similar to the proposed project, the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would require a change of the project site’s General Plan Land Use designation from Agriculture to Residential – Medium Density, Residential – High Density, Residential Greenspace Overlay, Urban Agriculture Transition Area, and Mixed Use. This alternative would be required to be consistent with the General Plan, including the goals, policies, and standards and with the Zoning Code. The analysis in Section 3.10 concluded that the proposed project would not result in any significant land use impacts. This alternative would provide increased housing for the city, but less variety in the type of housing. Similar to the proposed project, upon approval of the General Plan amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the adopted General Plan and other land use regulations, and therefore, would have similar impacts as the proposed project.

Noise and Vibration

As discussed in Section 3.11, the primary sources of noise associated with implementation of the proposed project are from increased vehicle trips on study area roadways in the project vicinity

from on-site uses, and increased noise from the proposed mechanical equipment, swimming pool, and dog park. Under this alternative, noise associated with vehicle trips is expected to increase, while other on-site noise sources would likely be comparable to those generated by the proposed project. The proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 3,586 new external vehicle trips on a daily basis. Under this alternative, the conventional residential uses developed on the project site would generate a greater number of daily vehicle trips and peak hour trips, which would generate increased noise levels on area roadways. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would expose new residential uses to noise sources. Therefore, due to the increase in peak hour vehicle trips, this alternative would have increased impacts related to noise when compared to the proposed project.

Population and Housing

This alternative would result in the construction of the same number of housing units over the same area as the proposed project, but the units would not be age-restricted. As discussed in Section 3.12, the proposed project would allow for a maximum population of approximately 1,467 residents, based on the number of units planned for development.¹ It is noted that, because 86% of the proposed units would be age-restricted, the actual population growth resulting from the project would likely be significantly lower. For example, the average persons per household in California for homes with a household head that is 55 years or older is 1.87. The maximum population associated with the project, 1,467 persons, utilizes the persons per household rate for the City of Davis of 2.62 persons. Additionally, the proposed project includes up to 30 assisted living, age-restricted detached units within the three-acre University Retirement Community expansion area. These 30 units would likely house only one persons per unit.

Under the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative, the project site would be developed similar to the proposed project with up to 560 units, but the units would not be age-restricted. For the aforementioned reasons, this alternative would be more likely to result in 1,467 residents in the area as compared to the proposed project.

As discussed in Section 3.12, the City's 1% Growth Policy would allow approximately 263 dwelling units per year, based on the Department of Finance (DOF) estimate of 26,366 units in 2017. Because second units, vertical mixed use units, and permanently affordable very low, low, and moderate income housing are exempt from the City's 1% Growth Policy, the 150 affordable units would not count towards the growth limit. The expected increase in 410 residential units, over a multi-year construction period, would not exceed the limits set by the 1% Growth Policy.

Because the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would not be exempt from the Policy, this alternative would exceed the housing limit set by the City's 1% Growth Policy; however, the 1% Growth Policy requires larger projects (such as 100 or more units) to use a

¹ Calculated using 2.62 persons per household for the City of Davis, California (Department of Finance, 2016).

development agreement or a metered allocation system to phase units. Nevertheless, because the alternative would add additional residents as compared with the proposed project, and exceed the allowable annual growth set by the City's 1% Growth Policy, impacts related to population and housing would be increased as compared to the proposed project.

Public Services and Recreation

This alternative would result in the construction of the same number of housing units as compared to the proposed project. As described in Section 3.13, implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in demand for police and fire protection services, as well as increased demand for schools, parks, and other public facilities. As discussed previously, there would be a greater change in the population generated under this alternative when compared to the proposed project. In addition, a project without age restrictions would be expected to have a greater number of school-age children, and a correspondingly greater impact on schools. As such, this alternative would have an increased demand for public services compared to the proposed project. Additionally, the level of increased demand for recreational facilities would slightly increase as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to public services and recreation would be greater than the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation

As described above, this alternative would result in an increase in total daily vehicle trips when compared to the proposed project, which would in turn increase the peak hour AM and PM vehicle trips. The proposed project is estimated to generate up to 3,586 new external vehicle trips on a daily basis, including 246 AM and 290 PM peak hour trips, respectively. Under this alternative, the conventional residential uses developed on the project site would generate a greater number of daily vehicle trips and peak hour trips. This increase in AM and PM peak hour trips under this alternative would generate increased traffic levels on area roadways when compared to the proposed project. This has the potential to increase impacts to area roadways and intersections. Impacts related to traffic and circulation would be increased under this alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Utilities

This alternative would result in the construction of the same number of housing units over the same area as the proposed project, but the units would not be age-restricted. As shown in Table 3.15-1 in Section 3.15, the proposed project would generate approximately 133,575 gallons per day (gpd), or 0.13 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater. The wastewater generation factors provided by City staff in an August 1, 2012 Utility Guidance Letter that were used to calculate the project's sewer flows do not differentiate between age-restricted and non-age restricted units. Therefore, because the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would result in the same number of units as the proposed project, the wastewater generated by this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

As shown in Table 3.15-17 in Section 3.15, the proposed project would generate the demand for approximately 216 acre-feet per year (AFY) of water. The unit water demand factors provided from the Tully & Young Water Supply Assessment prepared for the City of Davis (August 2017) do not differentiate between age-restricted and non-age restricted units. Therefore, because the Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would result in the same number of units as the proposed project, the water demand for this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

Using the General Plan Update EIR's generation rate of 3.12 pounds per person per day, the proposed project would generate approximately 4,577 pounds per day (lbs/day) of solid waste from the proposed residential uses. This is equivalent to a total of approximately 2.29 tons/day of solid waste. Additionally, as described in Section 2.0, current plans for the proposed mixed use area include an 8,000 square foot (sf) health club and a 5,000 sf "fast casual" restaurant. In order to determine solid waste generation from the proposed health club, a rate of 5.0 lbs/day, per 1,000 sf was used. In order to determine solid waste generation from the proposed restaurant, a rate of 0.005 lbs/day, per sf was used. These waste generation rates are consistent with the guidance provided by the California Department of Recycling and Resources Recovery for commercial uses. Therefore, the non-residential components of the project would generate up to 65 lbs/day (40 lbs/day from the health club and 25 lbs/day from the restaurant) of solid waste. Total solid waste generated by all aspects of the project would be 4,642 lbs/day, or approximately 2.32 tons/day.

The Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would include development of the same number of units and the same amenities as the proposed project. However, as noted previously, this alternative would be more likely to result in 1,467 residents in the area as compared to the proposed project due to the non-age restricted units. As such, the solid waste generated by this alternative would likely be slightly greater than the proposed project.

Overall, under this alternative, wastewater generation, water demand, and solid waste generation would increase slightly when compared to the proposed project. This alternative would have increased impacts to utilities when compared to the proposed project.

HIGHER DENSITY, LESS LAND ALTERNATIVE

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

This alternative would result in the construction of 560 dwelling units on approximately 37 acres of the project site. The overall development intensity under this alternative would be greater than the proposed project. The assumed type of units would be adjusted to reflect the increased density. In order to provide the same number of units on a smaller area, the buildings would likely be taller under this alternative. When compared to the proposed project, approximately half of the project site would be developed with residential uses, leaving the remainder of the site for agricultural land mitigation area and stormwater detention facilities. This would reduce impacts related to light and glare as well as the visual quality of the site and its surroundings. Overall, due to approximately half of the site remaining in its existing state under this

alternative, this alternative would have slightly fewer impacts to aesthetics when compared to the proposed project.

Agricultural Resources

This alternative would result in the construction of the same number of housing units and the same area of mixed-use as the proposed project, but on a smaller footprint than the proposed project. The increased density under this alternative would allow a portion of the required agricultural land mitigation area and stormwater detention facilities to be located on the project site. Under this alternative, approximately half of the project site, which is zoned for agricultural uses by the County, would remain in its existing state. This increase in preserved agricultural area would decrease impacts to Important Farmland compared to the project. Therefore, this impact would be reduced under this alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality

This alternative would result in the construction of the same number of dwelling units as the proposed project (up to 560), but on a smaller footprint than the proposed project. As described in Section 3.2, implementation of the proposed project would generate emissions during both the construction phase and the operational phase. Construction related impacts would be less under this alternative when compared to the proposed project, as the area of ground disturbance would be approximately half, although the duration of construction would be comparable. However, under this alternative, mobile source emissions would be similar to the proposed project. Mobile source (vehicle emissions) are directly related to the number of vehicle trips generated by a project. The proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 3,586 new external vehicle trips on a daily basis. Under this alternative, the residential uses developed on the project site would generate a similar number of daily vehicle trips as the proposed project, which would generate similar levels of pollutants from mobile sources. Therefore, this alternative would have slightly decreased impacts related to air quality when compared to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Potential impacts to biological resources are related primarily to the area proposed for disturbance and less to the type of urban uses that would occur on the project site. Under this alternative, approximately half of the project site would be disturbed when compared to the proposed project. As such, the potential for impacts to biological resources would be reduced when compared to the proposed project.

Cultural and Tribal Resources

Potential impacts to cultural resources are primarily related to the area proposed for disturbance and less to the type of urban uses that would occur on the project site. Under this alternative, approximately half of the project site would be disturbed when compared to the

proposed project. As such, the potential for impacts to cultural resources would be reduced when compared to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

This alternative would result in the construction of the same number of housing units as compared to the proposed project over approximately half the area as the proposed project. These buildings and structures would be exposed to the same level of risk from geologic hazards as the proposed project. Because the same number units would be constructed under the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative, a similar number of residents would be exposed to the risks from geologic hazards as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this impact would be similar under this alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change, and Energy

This alternative would result in the construction of the same number of housing units as the proposed project over approximately half the area as the proposed project. Development of the project site under this alternative would provide for a development that is consistent with SACOG's SCS. Similar to the proposed project, the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would assist with regional GHG reduction efforts by providing a residential project at a density level that meets the SCS goals. Construction related impacts would be less under this alternative when compared to the proposed project, as the area of ground disturbance would be approximately half, although the duration of construction would be comparable. Additionally, as described above, this alternative would result in a similar number of daily vehicle trips as the proposed project. This alternative would generate similar levels of GHGs from vehicles as the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would have slightly decreased impacts related to GHGs when compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative, the project site would be developed with the same number of dwelling units as the proposed project (up to 560), but on a smaller footprint than the proposed project. These buildings and structures would be exposed to the same level of risk from previous site contamination hazards as the proposed project. This impact would remain unchanged under this alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative, approximately half of the project site would be covered with impervious surfaces compared to the proposed project. While groundwater recharge is not considered a significant impact under the proposed project, under this alternative, approximately half of the land will be kept in its present state with half of the project site containing permeable surfaces.

Stormwater from the proposed project buildings and site would flow into the proposed greenway swales, perimeter drainage channel, and offsite detention basin. In order to meet the guidelines and requirements set forth in the "Phase II Small MS4 General Permit, 2013-0001-

DWQ,” dated February 5, 2013, adopted by the City of Davis, permanent storm water control measures are proposed to be incorporated into the project in order to mitigate the impacts of pollutants in storm water runoff from the proposed project. In order to meet the guidelines and requirements set forth in the “Phase II Small MS4 General Permit, 2013-0001-DWQ,” dated February 5, 2013, the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would be required to develop permanent storm water control measures and incorporate these measures into the alternative in order to mitigate the impacts of pollutants in storm water runoff from the alternative. Because the alternative would be required to implement improvements in order to manage and treat stormwater flows from the site, impacts related to water quality would be similar.

As described in Section 3.9, when the proposed project is developed, the on-site impervious area would increase, leading to faster runoff rates. As noted above, under this alternative, approximately half of the land will be kept in its present state with half of the project site containing permeable surfaces, which would also result in fewer impacts related to rainfall infiltration and runoff during storm events as compared to the proposed project.

As described in Section 3.9, project implementation has the potential to result in the discharge of pollutants into on-site detention basins and storm drains, and would change the existing drainage pattern on the site, although these impacts are less than significant as a result of project design and applied mitigation measures. The increased density under this alternative would allow a portion of the required agricultural land mitigation area and stormwater detention facilities to be located on the project site. Under the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative, these potential impacts would be slightly fewer than the project. Overall, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be reduced under the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Land Use

Similar to the proposed project, the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would require a change of the project site’s General Plan Land Use designation from Agriculture to Residential – Medium Density, Residential – High Density, Residential Greenspace Overlay, Urban Agriculture Transition Area, and Mixed Use. This alternative would be required to be consistent with the General Plan, including the goals, policies, and standards and with the Zoning Code. The analysis in Section 3.10 concluded that the proposed project would not result in any significant land use impacts. This alternative would provide increased housing for the city, and would also provide a variety of housing types. Similar to the proposed project, upon approval of the General Plan amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the adopted General Plan and other land use regulations, and therefore, would have similar impacts as the proposed project.

Noise and Vibration

As discussed in Section 3.11, the primary sources of noise associated with implementation of the proposed project are from increased vehicle trips on study area roadways in the project vicinity from on-site uses, and increased noise from the proposed mechanical equipment, swimming

pool, and dog park. Under this alternative, noise associated with vehicle trips is expected to be comparable to those generated by the proposed project. The proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 3,586 new external vehicle trips on a daily basis. Under this alternative, the higher density residential uses developed on the project site would generate a comparable number of vehicle trips, which would generate increased noise levels on area roadways. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would expose new residential uses to noise sources. Therefore, this alternative would have similar impacts related to noise when compared to the proposed project.

Population and Housing

This alternative would result in the construction of the same number of housing units as the proposed project over approximately half the area as the proposed project. As discussed in Section 3.12, the proposed project would allow for a maximum population of approximately 1,467 residents, based on the number of units planned for development.² Because the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would result in the same number of units as the proposed project, this alternative would result in the same amount of population growth.

As discussed in Section 3.12, the City's 1% Growth Policy would allow approximately 263 dwelling units per year, based on the DOF estimate of 26,366 units in 2017. Both the proposed project and the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would not exceed the housing limit set by the City's 1% Growth Policy. Because the alternative would add the same number of residents as the proposed project, impacts related to population and housing would be similar compared to the proposed project.

Public Services and Recreation

This alternative would result in the construction of the same number of housing units as compared to the proposed project. As described in Section 3.13, implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in demand for police and fire protection services, as well as increased demand for schools, parks, and other public facilities. As discussed previously, the population generated under this alternative would be equal to the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have similar increases in demand for public services as the proposed project. Additionally, the level of increased demand for recreational facilities would be similar to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to public services and recreation would be similar to the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation

As described above, this alternative would result in an equal amount of total daily vehicle trips when compared to the proposed project, which would in turn result in an equal amount of peak hour AM and PM vehicle trips. Therefore, this alternative would generate similar traffic levels on

² Calculated using 2.62 persons per household for the City of Davis, California (Department of Finance, 2016).

area roadways as the proposed project. Impacts related to traffic and circulation would be similar to the proposed project.

Utilities

This alternative would result in the construction of the same number of housing units as the proposed project over approximately half the area as the proposed project. As shown in Table 3.15-1 in Section 3.15, the proposed project would generate approximately 133,575 gpd, or 0.13 mgd of wastewater. Because the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would result in the same number of units as the proposed project, the wastewater generated by this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

As shown in Table 3.15-17 in Section 3.15, the proposed project would generate the demand for approximately 216 AFY of water. Because the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would result in the same number of units as the proposed project, the water demand for this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

Using the General Plan Update EIR's generation rate of 3.12 pounds per person per day, the proposed project would generate approximately 4,577 lbs/day of solid waste from the proposed residential uses. This is equivalent to a total of approximately 2.29 tons/day of solid waste. Additionally, the non-residential components of the project would generate up to 65 lbs/day (40 lbs/day from the health club and 25 lbs/day from the restaurant) of solid waste. Total solid waste generated by all aspects of the project would be 4,642 lbs/day, or approximately 2.32 tons/day.

The Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would include development of the same number of units and the same amenities as the proposed project. As such, the solid waste generated by this alternative would likely be similar to the proposed project.

Overall, under this alternative, wastewater generation, water demand, and solid waste generation would be similar to the proposed project. This alternative would have similar impacts to utilities when compared to the proposed project.

OFF-SITE (INSIDE MACE CURVE) ALTERNATIVE

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Under the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative, the proposed project would be developed with a decrease in units at an off-site location. The overall development intensity under this alternative would be equal to the proposed project at 40 units per acre, but because the off-site location is smaller than the proposed project site, the alternative would provide a total of 360 units. The buildings would be a similar height as the proposed project, and the amenities and parking would also be similar to the proposed project. When compared to the proposed project, approximately the same area of the off-site location would be developed with residential uses. This would result in similar impacts related to light and glare as well as the visual quality of the site and its surroundings. However, due to the smaller site and reduction in units, impacts to

scenic vistas would be slightly reduced under this alternative. Overall, this alternative would have reduced impacts to aesthetics when compared to the proposed project.

Agricultural Resources

This alternative would result in the construction of the 200 fewer housing units as the proposed project, but at an off-site location. The off-site location is designated Agriculture by the Yolo County General Plan land use map has a County zoning of A-N. The off-site location is designated as Farmland of Local Importance by the Department of Conservation. Therefore, impacts related to conversion of Important Farmland would be reduced under this alternative. It is noted that, because the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative is also located adjacent to agricultural uses, a similar potential to result in indirect conversion of adjacent agricultural lands would also occur under this alternative. Overall, impacts to agricultural resources would be reduced under this alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality

Under this alternative, the proposed project would be developed with a decrease in units at an off-site location. As described in Section 3.2, implementation of the proposed project would generate emissions during both the construction phase and the operational phase. Construction related impacts would be less under this alternative when compared to the proposed project, as the area of ground disturbance would be reduced by approximately 27 acres, although the duration of construction would be comparable. Additionally, under this alternative, mobile source emissions would be reduced when compared to the proposed project. Mobile source (vehicle emissions) are directly related to the number of vehicle trips generated by a project. The proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 3,586 new external vehicle trips on a daily basis. Under this alternative, the reduced unit count developed on the project site would generate fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project, which would generate reduced levels of pollutants from mobile sources. Therefore, this alternative would have decreased impacts related to air quality when compared to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Potential impacts to biological resources are related primarily to the area proposed for disturbance and less to the type of urban uses that would occur on the project site. Under this alternative, the majority of the 47-acre property located inside the Mace Curve, adjacent to Harper Junior High School, would be disturbed. The existing habitat on this property includes disturbed grass and agricultural uses. The habitat types on the proposed project site and the off-site property are similar. For example, the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative and the project site both have drainage channels which may provide habitat for giant garter snake. Both sites also have elderberry shrubs, which provide suitable habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle. Therefore, the potential for impacts to biological resources would be similar compared to the proposed project.

Cultural and Tribal Resources

Potential impacts to cultural resources are primarily related to the area proposed for disturbance and less to the type of urban uses that would occur on the project site. Under this alternative, the majority of the 47-acre property would be disturbed, and the potential for impacts to cultural resources would be similar when compared to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

This alternative would result in the construction of 200 fewer housing units as compared to the proposed project over a smaller area as compared to the proposed project. These buildings and structures would be exposed to the same level of risk from geologic hazards as the proposed project. The off-site property is currently vacant and undeveloped. Because both the proposed project and the off-site location are both currently undeveloped sites located on previous agricultural land, both sites likely contain similar soil characteristics. However, because 200 fewer units would be constructed under the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative, fewer residents would be exposed to the risks from geologic hazards as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this impact would be slightly decreased under this alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change, and Energy

This alternative would result in the construction of 200 fewer housing units than the proposed project at a smaller off-site location. The off-site property is designated for High Density Mixed Residential by SACOG's Blueprint. Development of the off-site property under this alternative would provide for a development that is consistent with SACOG's SCS. Similar to the proposed project, the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would assist with regional GHG reduction efforts by providing a residential project at a density level that meets the SCS goals. Construction related impacts would be less under this alternative when compared to the proposed project, as the area of ground disturbance would be reduced by approximately 20 acres, although the duration of construction would be comparable. Additionally, as described above, this alternative would result in fewer daily vehicle trips as compared to the proposed project. As such, this alternative would generate less GHGs from vehicles as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would have decreased impacts related to GHGs when compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would result in the construction of fewer housing units than the proposed project at an off-site location. The off-site property is currently vacant and undeveloped and was previously used for agricultural uses. Mitigation similar to the proposed project would be required in order to ensure that potential contamination hazards associated with the past agricultural uses would be reduced. This impact would remain unchanged under this alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative a reduced amount of land would be covered with impervious surfaces compared to the proposed project. In order to meet the guidelines and requirements set forth in the “Phase II Small MS4 General Permit, 2013-0001-DWQ,” dated February 5, 2013, the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would be required to develop permanent storm water control measures and incorporate these measures into the alternative in order to mitigate the impacts of pollutants in storm water runoff from the alternative. Because the alternative would be required to implement improvements in order to manage and treat stormwater flows from the site, impacts related to water quality would be similar.

As described in Section 3.9, when the proposed project is developed, the on-site impervious area would increase, leading to faster runoff rates. As noted above, under this alternative, a reduced amount of land would be covered with permeable surfaces, which would also result in fewer impacts related to rainfall infiltration and runoff during storm events as compared to the proposed project.

As described in Section 3.9, project implementation has the potential to result in the discharge of pollutants into on-site detention basins and storm drains, and would change the existing drainage pattern on the site, although these impacts are less than significant as a result of project design and applied mitigation measures. The increased density under this alternative would allow a portion of the required agricultural land mitigation area and stormwater detention facilities to be located on the off-site property. Under the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative, these potential impacts would be slightly fewer than the project. Overall, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be reduced under the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Land Use

The off-site property has the same agricultural zoning designation as the proposed project site. Development of the site would require similar land use entitlements as the proposed project, including a rezone, General Plan amendment, and voter approval under “Measure R.” This alternative would be required to be consistent with the General Plan, including the goals, policies, and standards and with the Zoning Code. Similar to the proposed project site, development of this off-site location would require a Measure R vote. The analysis in Section 3.10 concluded that the proposed project would not result in any significant land use impacts. This alternative would provide increased housing for the city, and would also provide a variety of housing types. Similar to the proposed project, upon approval of the General Plan amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the adopted General Plan and other land use regulations, and therefore, would have similar impacts as the proposed project.

Noise and Vibration

As discussed in Section 3.11, the primary sources of noise associated with implementation of the proposed project are from increased vehicle trips on study area roadways in the project vicinity

from on-site uses, and increased noise from the proposed mechanical equipment, swimming pool, and dog park. Under this alternative, due to the decrease in units compared to the project, noise associated with vehicle trips is expected to decrease compared to the proposed project, while other on-site noise sources would likely be comparable to those generated by the proposed project. The proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 3,586 new external vehicle trips on a daily basis. Under this alternative, the reduced unit count developed on the off-site property would generate fewer daily vehicle trips, which would generate decreased noise levels on area roadways. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would expose new residential uses to noise sources. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts related to noise when compared to the proposed project.

Population and Housing

This alternative would result in the construction of fewer housing units than the proposed project at an off-site location. As discussed in Section 3.12, the proposed project would allow for a maximum population of approximately 1,467 residents, based on the number of units planned for development.³ Because the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would result in fewer units than the proposed project, this alternative would result in less population growth.

As discussed in Section 3.12, the City's 1% Growth Policy would allow approximately 263 dwelling units per year, based on the DOF estimate of 26,366 units in 2017. Both the proposed project and the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would not exceed the housing limit set by the City's 1% Growth Policy. Because the alternative would add fewer residents than the proposed project, impacts related to population and housing would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Public Services and Recreation

This alternative would result in the construction of fewer housing units than the proposed project. As described in Section 3.13, implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in demand for police and fire protection services, as well as increased demand for schools, parks, and other public facilities. As discussed previously, the population generated under this alternative would be less than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have reduced increases in demand for public services than the proposed project. Additionally, the level of increased demand for recreational facilities would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to public services and recreation would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

³ Calculated using 2.62 persons per household for the City of Davis, California (Department of Finance, 2016).

Transportation and Circulation

Due to the off-site location in east Davis, the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would introduce additional vehicle trips onto different area roadways than those identified in Section 3.14 for the proposed project. As described above, this alternative would result in a decrease in daily vehicle trips when compared to the proposed project. The proposed project is estimated to generate 3,586 new external vehicle trips on a daily basis. Under this alternative, the residential uses developed on the off-site property would generate fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project due to the reduced unit count under this alternative. This alternative would decrease the amount of daily vehicle trips generated, although the alternative would still have the potential to increase impacts to area roadways and intersections. The major area roadways that the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative could potentially impact include: Interstate 80, State Route 113, Mace Boulevard, East Covell Boulevard, County Road 32A, County Road 30B/104A, Alhambra Drive, and 2nd Street. Impacts related to traffic and circulation would be decreased under this alternative when compared to the proposed project.

Utilities

This alternative would result in the construction of 200 fewer housing units than the proposed project over the 47-acre off-site property. As shown in Table 3.15-1 in Section 3.15, the proposed project would generate approximately 133,575 gpd, or 0.13 mgd of wastewater. Because the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would result in fewer units than the proposed project, the wastewater generated by this alternative would be less than under the proposed project.

As shown in Table 3.15-17 in Section 3.15, the proposed project would generate the demand for approximately 216 AFY of water. Because the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would result in fewer units than the proposed project, the water demand for this alternative would be less than the proposed project.

Using the General Plan Update EIR's generation rate of 3.12 pounds per person per day, the proposed project would generate approximately 4,577 lbs/day of solid waste from the proposed residential uses. This is equivalent to a total of approximately 2.29 tons/day of solid waste. Additionally, the non-residential components of the project would generate up to 65 lbs/day (40 lbs/day from the health club and 25 lbs/day from the restaurant) of solid waste. Total solid waste generated by all aspects of the project would be 4,642 lbs/day, or approximately 2.32 tons/day.

The Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would include development of fewer units than the proposed project and the same amenities as the project. As such, the solid waste generated by this alternative would likely be less than the proposed project.

Overall, under this alternative, wastewater generation, water demand, and solid waste generation would be less than the proposed project. This alternative would have fewer impacts to utilities when compared to the proposed project.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives that are analyzed in the EIR. If the No Project (No Build) Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, an EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)). The environmentally superior alternative is that alternative with the least adverse environmental impacts when compared to the proposed project.

A comparative analysis of the proposed project and each of the project alternatives is provided in Table 5.0-1 below. The table includes a numerical scoring system, which assigns a score of “2,” “3,” or “4” to the proposed project and each of the alternatives with respect to how each alternative compares to the proposed project in terms of the severity of the environmental topics addressed in this EIR. A score of “2” indicates that the alternative would have a better (or lessened) impact when compared to the proposed project. A score of “3” indicates that the alternative would have the same (or equal) level of impact when compared to the proposed project. A score of “4” indicates that the alternative would have a worse (or greater) impact when compared to the proposed project. The project alternative with the lowest total score is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

TABLE 5.0-1: COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE PROJECT IMPACTS TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE	PROPOSED PROJECT	NO PROJECT (NO BUILD) ALTERNATIVE	CONVENTIONAL (NON-AGE RESTRICTED) ALTERNATIVE	HIGHER DENSITY, LESS LAND ALTERNATIVE	OFF-SITE (INSIDE MACE CURVE) ALTERNATIVE
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	3 – Same	2 – Less	3 – Same	2 – Less	2 – Less
Agricultural Resources	3 – Same	2 – Less	3 – Same	2 – Less	2 – Less
Air Quality	3 – Same	2 – Less	4 – Greater	2 – Less	2 – Less
Biological Resources	3 – Same	2 – Less	3 – Same	2 – Less	3 – Same
Cultural and Tribal Resources	3 – Same	2 – Less	3 – Same	2 – Less	3 – Same
Geology and Soils	3 – Same	2 – Less	4 – Greater	3 – Same	2 – Less
Greenhouse Gas, Climate Change, and Energy	3 – Same	2 – Less	4 – Greater	2 – Less	2 – Less
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3 – Same	2 – Less	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same
Hydrology and Water Quality	3 – Same	2 – Less	3 – Same	2 – Less	2 – Less
Land Use	3 – Same	4 – Greater	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same
Noise and Vibration	3 – Same	2 – Less	4 – Greater	3 – Same	2 – Less
Population and Housing	3 – Same	3 – Same	4 – Greater	3 – Same	2 – Less
Public Services and Recreation	3 – Same	2 – Less	4 – Greater	3 – Same	2 – Less
Transportation and Circulation	3 – Same	2 – Less	4 – Greater	3 – Same	2 – Less
Utilities	3 – Same	2 – Less	4 – Greater	3 – Same	2 – Less
Summary	45	33	53	38	34

As shown in Table 5.0-1, the (No Project (No Build) Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative when looked at in terms of all potentially significant environmental impacts. However, as required by CEQA, when the No Project (No Build) Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the environmentally superior alternative among the others must be identified. The Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would result in 53 points, the (Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would result in 38 points, and the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would result in 34 points. Therefore, the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative is the next environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project. It is

noted that the superior alternative would depend on the City's local priorities (i.e., preservation of agricultural land, traffic impacts to the regional roadway system, maintenance of public services and utilities services, etc.), as well as the ability to meet the proposed project's objectives. Each alternative's ability to satisfy the project objectives is discussed in the following section.

5.4 COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES TO SATISFY PROJECT OBJECTIVES

This section examines how each of the alternatives selected for more detailed analysis meets the project objectives.

1. *Create a community that connects the City's senior population to existing services and facilities in West Davis.*

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not satisfy this project objective because under this alternative, no development would occur and the site would remain unchanged. The Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would not meet this objective because the alternative would provide up to 560 conventional apartments not oriented to the City's senior population. In contrast, the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would meet this objective because the alternative would provide the same number of dwelling units as the proposed project (up to 560), but on a smaller footprint than the proposed project. The Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would result in the development of up to 360 units for the City's senior population. However, due to the off-site property's location in East Davis, this alternative would not connect seniors to existing services and facilities in West Davis. As such, the Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would only partially meet this objective.

2. *Design a neighborhood with homes to support an active lifestyle for older adults.*

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not satisfy this project objective because under this alternative, no development would occur and the site would remain unchanged. The Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would not meet this objective because the alternative would not provide homes which support an active lifestyle for older adults. The Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would meet this objective because the alternative would provide market-rate, assisted living units, and affordable apartments for older adults in the City. The Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would only partially meet the objective because, although the residential uses would support an active lifestyle for older adults, this alternative would result in 200 fewer units than the proposed project. This alternative would satisfy this objective to a lesser degree than the proposed project.

3. *Create a diverse community that provides housing for multiple generations and lifestyles.*

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not satisfy this project objective because under this alternative, no development would occur and the site would remain unchanged. The

5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would partially meet this objective because the alternative would provide housing for multiple generations and lifestyles, including non-age restricted families and affordable housing for low income families. However, because this alternative would not provide any age-restricted housing, this objective would only be partially met. The Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would meet this objective because the alternative would provide housing for multiple generations and lifestyles, including market-rate, assisted living units, and affordable apartments for older adults. The Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would only partially meet the objective because, although this alternative would provide housing for multiple generations and lifestyles, this alternative would result in 200 fewer units than the proposed project. This alternative would satisfy this objective to a lesser degree than the proposed project.

4. *Provide Davis residents with housing options that meets their long-term needs so they remain local rather than leave the City.*

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not satisfy this project objective because under this alternative, no development would occur and the site would remain unchanged. The Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would meet this objective because the alternative would provide Davis residents with housing options that meet their long-term needs so they remain local. Similarly, the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would provide Davis residents with housing options that meet their long-term needs and would also meet this objective. The Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would only partially meet the objective because, although this alternative would provide housing for Davis residents, this alternative would result in 200 fewer units than the proposed project. This alternative would satisfy this objective to a lesser degree than the proposed project.

5. *Provide a community that is not isolated from the rest of the City by providing public gathering spaces for all City residents.*

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not satisfy this project objective because under this alternative, no development would occur and the site would remain unchanged. The Conventional (Non-Age Restricted) Alternative would meet this objective because the alternative would provide a community that is not isolated from the rest of the City by providing public gathering spaces for all City residents. Similarly, the Higher Density, Less Land Alternative would provide public gathering spaces for all City residents and would also meet this objective. The Off-Site (Inside Mace Curve) Alternative would also meet the objective because this alternative would provide amenities and public gathering spaces for all City residents, similar to the proposed project.