

# CHAPTER 5

## ALTERNATIVES

---

### 5.1 ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT AND SCREENING PROCESS

CEQA requires an evaluation of the comparative effects of a range of reasonable alternatives to the project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(a)). The range of alternatives is governed by the “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (Section 15126.6(f)). Evaluation of a No Project Alternative and identification of an environmentally superior alternative is required. The significant effects of the alternatives shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the proposed project (Section 15126.6(d)).

This chapter discusses the following alternatives to the proposed sale: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Partial Sale – Exclude Cluster 9 Alternative; and 3) Partial Sale – Exclude Cluster 12 Alternative. The components of these alternatives are described below, including a discussion of their impacts and how they would differ from those under the proposed sale.

CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed (Section 15126.6(a)), and suggest that an EIR also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible (Section 15126.6(c)). This chapter of the EIR also addresses these issues.

Of the alternatives assessed in this EIR, the alternative with the least environmental impact would be the No Project Alternative. Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines states that if the environmentally superior alternative is the no project alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Among the other alternatives, Alternatives 2 and 3 (Partial Sale - Exclusion of Cluster 9 and/or 12) are the environmentally superior alternatives.

### 5.2 ALTERNATIVES SCREENING METHODOLOGY

The alternatives addressed in this EIR were selected in consideration of one or more of the following factors:

- the extent to which the alternative would accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project (see “Project Goals and Objectives” in Chapter 3);
- the extent to which the alternative would avoid or lessen any of the identified significant adverse environmental effects of the project;

- the feasibility of the alternative, taking into account site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, consistency with regulatory limitations, and the reasonability of the project sponsor's acquiring or controlling the site;
- the appropriateness of the alternative in contributing to a "reasonable range" of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice; and
- the requirement of CEQA Guidelines to consider a "no project" alternative as well as an "environmentally superior" alternative (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6).

In consideration of the above factors, three alternatives were selected to be addressed in this EIR. Each of these alternatives is described below, together with the basis for its selection.

### **5.3 DESCRIPTIONS OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

#### **ALTERNATIVE 1: No Project**

##### ***DESCRIPTION***

Under the No Project Alternative, the lots proposed for sale by SCG would not be sold. As none of the lots would be sold, the future connected action that would result from the sale of the lots (residential and some commercial development) would also not occur. SCG would maintain ownership of the 36 lots; the site characteristics of which would remain in their existing condition, as described in Chapter 3, Project Description, and in the setting sections of Chapter 4 of this EIR. SCG would continue to conduct on-going maintenance activities to maintain the abandoned wells.

##### ***BASIS FOR SELECTION***

The No Project Alternative is included in this EIR because *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(e)(1), requires that an EIR evaluate a "no project" alternative along with its impact in order to provide a comparison of the impacts of approving the proposed sale with the impacts of not approving the proposed sale. Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B), the No Project Alternative discusses "the property remaining in its existing state."

##### ***DISTINCTIVE ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS***

The following summarizes potential impacts of the "No Project" alternative and compares them to the impacts of the proposed sale. If the alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative are discussed.

### **Air Quality**

No change in air emissions, other than those changes due to emissions from cumulative projects, would occur. The No Project Alternative would avoid potential impacts from emissions such as diesel particulate matter from construction equipment. The No Project Alternative would also avoid air quality impacts that would result from onsite operational emissions, such as combustion of natural gas and operation of mobile sources. This alternative would avoid potential air quality impacts related to the construction of the lots proposed for sale.

### **Biological Resources**

No construction would occur and therefore, potential impacts to special status raptors and other avian species would not exist. The No Project Alternative would avoid potential biological impacts to the monarch butterfly and globose dune beetle related to construction and occupancy of the lots proposed for sale.

### **Cultural Resources**

No construction or change in present site conditions would occur under this alternative. The impacts would be essentially the same as existing conditions. As a result, the No Project Alternative would avoid potential impacts to cultural resources related to the development of the lots proposed for sale.

### **Geology and Soils**

Other than cumulative projects, no construction would occur under this alternative. No change in geologic conditions would occur. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would avoid potential geologic impacts related to the development of the lots proposed for sale.

### **Public Health**

Impacts to public health would remain the same as under existing conditions. The No Project Alternative would avoid potential impacts from exposure to contaminants that may be contained in the soil during excavation and occupation activities. The No Project Alternative would avoid potential public health impacts related to the development of the lots proposed for sale.

### **Public Safety**

No construction or change in present site conditions would occur under this alternative. The impacts would be essentially the same as under existing conditions. Therefore, The No Project Alternative would avoid potential public safety impacts related to the development of the lots proposed for sale.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

The impacts would be essentially the same as under existing conditions. The potential increase in stormwater runoff resulting from construction activities or changes in drainage patterns would not

occur. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would avoid potential hydrology and water quality impacts related to the development of the lots proposed for sale.

### **Noise**

The impacts would be essentially the same as under existing conditions. As a result, the No Project Alternative would avoid the addition of potential noise impacts related to the development of the lots proposed for sale.

### **Transportation and Traffic**

Because no new construction would occur at the site, the No Project Alternative would result neither in a temporary nor long-term increase in vehicle trip generation over existing conditions. As such, the No Project Alternative would not increase project traffic volumes on local roadways. Moreover, this alternative would avoid any potential impacts (albeit less than significant) associated with traffic intrusion into adjacent neighborhoods.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

The No Project Alternative would avoid the potential impacts related to additional domestic water demand from LADWP, wastewater capacity at the Hyperion Treatment Plant, and solid waste generation. As a result, the No Project Alternative would avoid the potential utilities and service systems impacts related to the development of the lots proposed for sale.

## **ALTERNATIVE 2: Partial Sale – Exclusion of Cluster 9**

### ***DESCRIPTION***

Under the Partial Sale Alternative – Exclusion of Cluster 9, potential adverse impacts to the monarch butterfly would be avoided. Under this alternative, the CPUC would authorize the sale of all of the lots proposed for sale except the lots contained in Cluster 9. The lots in Cluster 9 would remain in their existing conditions, as described in Chapter 3, Project Description, and in the setting sections of Chapter 4 of this EIR. This alternative is analyzed to include reasonably foreseeable development on the project lots; however, future development would not occur on the lots in Cluster 9.

### ***BASIS FOR SELECTION***

The Partial Sale Alternative is included in this EIR to provide a basis for comparing the affects of a partial sale to the proposed sale of all the lots. This alternative may, for example, reduce potentially significant impacts to biological resources, namely the monarch butterfly on Cluster 9.

### ***DISTINCTIVE ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS***

Similar to the proposed sale, Alternative 2, Exclusion of Cluster 9 would avoid potential impacts to the monarch butterfly in Cluster 9. Mitigation measures proposed for the project could

mitigate these potential impacts to globose dune beetle habitat. Impacts to biological resources under Alternative 2 would be less than under the proposed sale because monarch butterfly habitat would remain undisturbed.

As development of the lots would be reduced under this alternative, impacts to all other environmental areas would be slightly less than under the proposed sale.

### ALTERNATIVE 3: Partial Sale – Exclusion of Cluster 12

#### ***DESCRIPTION***

Under the Partial Sale Alternative – Exclusion of Cluster 12, potential adverse impacts to the globose dune beetle would be avoided. Under this alternative, the CPUC would authorize the sale of all of the lots proposed for sale except the lots contained in Cluster 12. The lots in Cluster 12 would remain in their existing conditions, as described in Chapter 3, Project Description, and in the setting sections of Chapter 4 of this EIR. This alternative is analyzed to include reasonably foreseeable development on the project lots; however, future development would not occur on the lots in Cluster 12.

#### ***BASIS FOR SELECTION***

The Partial Sale Alternative is included in this EIR to provide a basis for comparing the affects of a partial sale to the proposed sale of all the lots. This alternative may, for example, reduce potentially significant impacts to biological resources, namely the globose dune beetle in Cluster 12.

#### ***DISTINCTIVE ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS***

Similar to the proposed sale, Alternative 3, Exclusion of Cluster 12 from the proposed sale, would result in potential disturbance to the monarch butterfly because this option would include the sale and development of Cluster 9. However, this alternative would avoid potential impacts to the globose dune beetle in Cluster 12. Mitigation measures proposed for the project could mitigate these potential impacts to the monarch butterfly. Impacts to biological resources under Alternative 3 would be less than under the proposed sale because the globose dune beetle would remain undisturbed.

As development of the lots would be reduced under this alternative, impacts to all other environmental areas would be slightly less than under the proposed sale.

## **5.4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED AS INFEASIBLE**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (c) states that the “EIR should ...identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination.” This section of the

Guidelines goes on to state “among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.”

One alternative was considered but eliminated from this analysis. Under this alternative, SCG would have maintained ownership of the lots proposed for sale and the lots would have been developed as parks or common areas. While, this alternative was considered, it was rejected because it did not meet any of the project objectives of divestiture of SCG’s assets. Additionally, development of the lots for use as parks or common areas would have resulted in increased public access that could result in additional environmental impacts. For example, this alternative could result in less control of disturbances to biological resources on some of the lot (as described in Section 4.C, *Biological Resources* and Alternatives 2 and 3 above). Therefore, this alternative was eliminated from consideration.