

5 CEQA Considerations

This section of the EIR discusses long-term implications of the proposed project as required by CEQA. The topics discussed include significant irreversible commitment of resources, growth-inducing impacts, significant and unavoidable environmental effects, and effects found not to be significant. Cumulative impacts and alternatives to the proposed project are also discussed herein.

5.1 Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Effects

Unavoidable adverse impacts are those effects of the proposed project that would significantly affect either natural systems or other community resources, and cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level as identified in the previous analyses. The proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable environmental effects.

5.2 Significant Irreversible Changes

Section 15126.2(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to discuss the significant irreversible environmental changes that would be involved if the proposed project would be implemented. Examples include the following: uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project, since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely; primary and secondary impacts of a project that would generally commit future generations to similar uses (e.g., highway improvements that provide access to a previously inaccessible area); and/or irreversible damage that could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the proposed project.

Analysis

The proposed project is comprised of 18 single-family homes, which would be clustered primarily in the eastern portion of the project site around a common open space area. The proposed project also includes renovation of an existing private tennis and swim club, which would include retaining three of the existing 13 tennis courts; renovation of the existing clubhouse, swimming pool and spa, and the construction of 3,540-square-foot childcare facility and 2,100-square-foot café for a total of 11,670 square feet. A retention pond would be constructed in the southwestern portion of the project site that would serve as a retention basin for stormwater runoff within the project site.

A variety of nonrenewable and limited resources would be irretrievably committed for construction and operation of the proposed project, including but not limited to: oil, natural gas, gasoline, lumber, sand and gravel, asphalt, steel, water, land, energy, and construction materials. With respect to operational activities, compliance with all applicable building codes, as well as project mitigation measures or project requirements, would ensure that all natural resources are conserved or recycled to the maximum extent feasible.

The proposed project would result slight increase in demand on public services and utilities. For example, an increase in the intensity of land uses within the project site would result in an increase in regional electric energy consumption to satisfy additional electricity demands

from the proposed project. These energy resource demands relate to initial project construction, transport of goods and people, and lighting, heating, and cooling of buildings. However, the proposed project would not involve a wasteful or unjustifiable use of energy or other resources, and energy conservation efforts would occur with new construction. The proposed project would be constructed and operated in accordance with specifications contained in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the *City of Fremont Municipal Code*. In addition, the proposed project includes energy conservation measures as part of the project design (e.g. rooftop solar collectors, energy efficient lighting, etc.). Therefore, the use of energy on-site would occur in an efficient manner.

A portion of the project site is already developed as a tennis and swim club and increased development within the project site to support urban uses may be regarded as a permanent and irreversible change. The proposed project would generally commit future generations to similar urban uses within the project site.

5.3 Growth Inducement

CEQA requires that any growth-inducing aspect of a project be discussed in an EIR. According to CEQA, it must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental or of little significance to the environment. A project would have growth-inducing effects if it would:

- Foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing (either directly or indirectly) in the surrounding environment;
- Remove obstacles to population growth;
- Tax existing community services or facilities, requiring the construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects; or
- Encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.
- If a project meets any one of these criteria, it may be considered growth inducing. Generally, growth inducing projects are either located in isolated, undeveloped, or underdeveloped areas, necessitating the extension of major infrastructure such as sewer and water facilities or roadways, or encourage premature or unplanned growth.

To comply with CEQA, an EIR must discuss the ways in which the proposed project could promote economic or population growth in the vicinity of the project and how that growth will, in turn, affect the surrounding environment ([CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d)]).

Economic Effects

The proposed project would result in a slight increase in population growth through the construction of additional housing units on the project site. This slight increase in population would also slightly increase retail sales and personal service activities within the

City, as well as enhance the economic viability of the regional area. Although the project would induce some growth to the area, the economic effects would be imperceptible.

Remove Obstacles to and/or Foster Population Growth

Growth can be induced in a number of ways, including the direct construction of new homes and businesses, the elimination of obstacles to growth, or through the stimulation of economic activity within the region. The discussion of the removal of obstacles to growth relates directly to the removal of infrastructure limitations (typically through the provision of additional capacity or supply), or the reduction or elimination of regulatory constraints on growth that could result in growth unforeseen at the time of project approval.

The elimination of either physical or regulatory obstacles to growth is considered to be a growth-inducing effect. A physical obstacle to growth typically involves the lack of public service infrastructure. The extension of public service infrastructure, including roadways, water mains, and sewer lines, into areas that are not currently provided with these services would be expected to support new development. Similarly, the elimination or change to a regulatory obstacle, including existing growth and development policies, could result in new growth.

Based on the slight increase in population anticipated by the proposed project, substantial population growth would not be induced in the area beyond that already forecasted for the City. According to the *California Department of Finance*, the population in the City on January 1, 2010, was 218,128 persons living in 72,659 housing units, for an average of 3.03 persons per household. Based on these population estimates, the proposed project would generate approximately 54 new residents. The proposed project would be generally consistent with the nature of existing and surrounding single-family development. Therefore, the proposed project would not be growth inducing as a result of removing an obstacle to growth.

Tax Existing Community Services or Facilities

The proposed project would not require significant regional public infrastructure upgrades for any utility or service. The proposed project would be required to fund their fair share allocation of any necessary public infrastructure, as well as community services (e.g. schools). Therefore, the proposed project would not tax existing community services or facilities.

5.4 Energy Conservation

Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3) and Appendix F of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires a description (where relevant) of the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy caused by a project. In 1975, the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill 1575 (AB 1575) in response to the oil crisis of the 1970s. This bill created the California Energy Commission (CEC). The purpose of the CEC is to forecast future energy needs; license thermal power plants of 50 megawatts or larger; develop energy technologies and renewable energy resources; plan for and direct State responses

to energy emergencies; and to promote energy efficiency through the adoption and enforcement of appliance and building energy efficiency standards.

Energy Consumption

Short-Term Construction

The proposed project would include development of 18 single-family homes; renovation of an existing swim and tennis club and installation of a common open space area. There are no unusual project characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction equipment that would be less energy-efficient than at comparable construction sites in the region or State. Therefore, it is expected that construction fuel consumption associated with the proposed project would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than other similar development projects.

Long-Term Operations

Transportation Energy Demand

Pursuant to the Federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975, the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration is responsible for establishing additional vehicle standards and for revising existing standards. Since 1990, the fuel economy standard for new passenger cars has been 27.5 miles per gallon. Since 1996, the fuel economy standard for new light trucks (gross vehicle weight of 8,500 pounds or less) has been 20.7 miles per gallon. Heavy-duty vehicles (i.e., vehicles and trucks over 8,500 pounds gross vehicle weight) are not currently subject to fuel economy standards. Compliance with Federal fuel economy standards is not determined for each individual vehicle model. Rather, compliance is determined based on each manufacturer's average fuel economy for the portion of their vehicles produced for sale in the United States.

The proposed project is not anticipated to result in any unusual characteristics that would result in excessive long-term operational fuel consumption. The proposed project includes an interconnected trail network that would facilitate pedestrian travel within the project site and to the surrounding area. Fuel consumption associated with vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary.

Public Transportation Options

Alameda Contra Costa County (AC) Transit and Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) bus lines travel along Mission Boulevard in the vicinity of the project site providing connections to Fremont BART Station and destinations in Santa Clara County and south Fremont. VTA and AC Transit bus stops are located on the northeast and northwest corner of the intersection of Mission Boulevard/Las Palmas Avenue with the VTA servicing bus lines 120, 140 and 180 from Fremont BART station with destinations to Milpitas, San Jose and Mountain View. AC Transit services bus lines #215 and #217 with routes that include destinations to Bayside Industrial areas and Ohlone College. The availability of public transit for the residents and visitors to the project site would ensure that the

proposed project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of transportation energy.

Energy Efficiency Measures

California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6, is California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-residential Buildings. Title 24 was established by the CEC in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to create uniform building codes to reduce California's energy consumption, and provide energy efficiency standards for residential and non-residential buildings. In 2008, the CEC updated Title 24 standards with more stringent requirements effective January 1, 2010. The 2010 Standards are expected to substantially reduce the growth in electricity and natural gas use of new construction versus existing rules. Additional savings result from the application of the standards on building alterations. These savings are cumulative, increasing as years go by.

The proposed project would be required to adhere to all Federal, State, and local requirements for energy efficiency, including the CEC's Title 24 standards. In addition a residential development would be required to meet CalGreen Tier I building code requirements that also require exceeding Title 24 standards by 15 percent. The proposed project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of building energy. The proposed project would include the following green building measures to reduce energy and water use as follows:

- Buildings would be oriented and configured to provide optimize natural solar and wind benefits. The primary living spaces would be oriented south with an insulated concrete floor slab providing thermal mass. Operable external shades would provide solar control during hot summer months and would allow passive solar heating in the cool winter months;
- Roof and wall cavities would receive sprayed insulation that would be beyond the current code requirements and would include high performance glass with a modified specification at south-facing windows to enhance passive solar benefit;
- Energy-efficient lighting, such as LED lighting and low energy appliances would be installed;
- Include photovoltaic arrays with the intent of providing 100 percent of the each home's requirements dependent on tree shading of a home, with expansion space provided for future electric vehicles charging capacity, dependent on tree shading of a home;
- Efficient plumbing fixtures would be installed, as well as native landscaping and irrigation with a gray water system to reduce possible water consumption by more than 50 percent below baseline; and
- Building materials would include durable low maintenance and fire resistant materials.

As discussed above, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts on energy resources. There would not be any inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary energy usage in comparison to similar development projects of this nature regarding construction-related fuel consumption. Additionally, the availability of public transit services would ensure that the proposed project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of transportation energy. The proposed project would adhere to, and exceed, all Federal, State, and local requirements for energy efficiency, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations regarding building energy efficiency standards and the City Green Building Requirements. Therefore, the DDSP would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of building energy. Therefore, the proposed project would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary.

5.5 Effects Found Not to be Significant

A significant effect on the environment is generally defined as a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the physical environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15328). The term “environment,” as used in this definition, means the physical conditions that exist within the area that will be affected by a proposed project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. The area involved shall be the area in which significant effects would occur either directly or indirectly as a result of the proposed project. The “environment” includes both natural and man-made conditions (CEQA Guidelines Section 15360).

Detailed analyses and discussion of environmental topics found to be significant are provided within Section 3.0 of this EIR. Section 3.0 also identifies impacts that are found to be less than significant. The project site is an urban infill area and the environmental resources listed below either do not exist on the project site or are not considered to have the potential to cause a significant environmental impact. As such, detailed analyses of the following environmental resources were not included in the EIR:

- Agricultural and Forest Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities

Agricultural and Forest Resources

The project site is designated as “Urban and Built-Up Land” on the most recent *Alameda County Important Farmlands Map* that is published by the California Department of Conservation (DOC), a department of the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), which produces maps and statistical data used for analyzing impacts on California’s agricultural resources. The FMMP updates the maps every two years and the most recent map was prepared in 2008. Grazing Land is located north of the project site along Canyon Heights Drive, however there is no Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Unique Farmland in the project vicinity.

Mineral Resources

The California Department of Mines and Geology (DMG) has identified six sectors of regionally significant mineral deposits within the City. There are no mapped mineral deposits located in the project vicinity and there is no evidence that significant mineral deposits are present within the project site.

Public Services

Fire

Fire response to the project site would be provided by the Fremont Fire Department (FDD). The FDD also provides emergency medical response, which accounts for approximately 60 percent of all emergency calls to the FDD. According to the *City of Fremont General Plan EIR*, in 2010, the FDD responded to 12,958 calls for service, including 360 fire incidents and 8,700 emergency response or rescue calls. Emergency calls for fire-related incidents account for only about four percent of total calls to the Fire Department.

The FFD's fire-fighting capacity is augmented through its participation in the Alameda County Mutual Aid Plan with other fire agencies within Alameda County, who provide supplemental fire-fighting response to member agencies within Alameda County, who provide supplemental fire-fighting response to member agencies when needed to respond to larger fires or multiple simultaneous incidents. The City also participates in the California Master Mutual Aid Plan, which allows a resource request to be filled from an agency outside Alameda County.

The closest fire station to the project site is Fire Station #9 located at 39609 Stevenson Place located approximately half a mile southwest of the project site. The proposed project would not increase or change the determination of need for facilities of or result in any new adverse effects on the Fremont Fire Department. The proposed project would be subject to citywide Development Impact Fees, which would include fees for fire protection. Applicable fees shall be calculated and paid at the fee rates in effect at the time of building permit issuance. The proposed project would therefore have no impact on fire services.

Police

Police protection to the project site would be provided by the Fremont Police Department. The Department operates outside of one large station located at 2000 Stevenson Boulevard, which houses all of the Police Department functions. The Fremont Police Department is divided into sectors to minimize police response times for emergency calls and to enable the Department to meet its response time goal of five minutes for emergency calls. The Fremont Police Department has a current staff of 188 sworn officers, with a staffing rate of 0.89 sworn officers per 1,000 residents. The *City of Fremont General Plan EIR* noted that, while not currently planned, the police headquarters could be expanded from 64,000 square feet to 80,000 square feet sometime during the 20-year planning horizon of the General Plan; this expansion could occur with or without implementation of the General Plan Update. The proposed project would not increase or change the determination of need for facilities or result in any new adverse effects on the

Fremont Police Department. The proposed project would therefore have no impact on police services.

Schools

The project site is located within the Fremont Unified School District, which serves students in 29 elementary schools; five junior high schools; six high schools; an alternative school (serving grades 7-12) and an adult school. In addition, In addition to public elementary schools, the City is home to numerous private schools including Montessori schools, parochial schools, nursery schools, remedial schools, etc. The State of California operates two special schools in Fremont: the School for the Deaf and the School for the Blind, both of which serve students from pre-school or Kindergarten age through high school. Ohlone College, a two year community college is also located within the City.

The nearest private school is the Kimber Hills Academy, a private pre-school and daycare that is part of the Fremont Community Church located within a quarter mile of the project site. The nearest public schools to the project site include John Gomes Elementary School located at 555 Lemos Lane approximately 0.91 mile southeast of the project site; William Hopkins Junior High on 600 Driscoll Road approximately 1.24 miles southeast of the project site; and Mission San Jose High School located at 41717 Palm Avenue approximately 1.5 miles southeast of the project site. While students associated with the proposed project could be assigned to these schools, the Fremont Unified School District could assign them to other schools, depending on capacities and enrollment levels at these and other District schools. School assignment is decided by the Fremont Unified School District Board at the time of development. Approximately 10.2 students would be generated from an 18-unit development (0.57 per household). This includes seven children in kindergarten through sixth grade, one child in junior high, and two children in high school (Fremont Unified School District 2011).

Under California law, the payment of current school impact fees associated with a proposed development effectively mitigates any impact that such development may have on the facilities of the local school district. The Fremont Unified School District collects Level II school impact fees of \$4.87 per square foot for residential development and \$0.51 per square foot of commercial development. The proposed project would be required to pay the State-mandated school impact fees, and the proposed project would therefore have no impact on school services for the same reasons that were identified in the *City of Fremont General Plan EIR*.

Utilities

Wastewater

Wastewater from the project site would be treated at the Alvarado Wastewater Treatment Plan that is operated by the Union Sanitary District (USD). The wastewater treatment plant provides primary and secondary treatment of wastewater for the tri-cities area, which includes the cities of Fremont, Newark, and Union City. The current treatment

capacity of the plant is 33 million gallons per day (mgd) and average daily flows were 35.09 mgd in 2010 (City of Fremont 2011).

Assuming a generation rate of 200 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater for residential uses, the proposed project would generate 3,600 gpd or of wastewater. This is approximately 0.01 percent over current (2010) flow rates. The *City of Fremont General Plan EIR* determined that the sewer network and the capacity of the Alvarado Wastewater Treatment Plant currently have capacity to accommodate the level of development anticipated under the General Plan Update. It identified a potentially significant impact on the sewage collection system for any residential development projects that exceed a density of 29.9 units per acre. The proposed project would be significantly below that threshold. Therefore, the impacts to the wastewater treatment plant have already addressed in the *City of Fremont General Plan EIR* and the proposed project would have no impact.

Solid Waste

Solid waste collection in the City is provided by Allied Waste Services of Alameda County. Solid waste from the proposed project is then processed at the Fremont Recycling and Transfer Station located at 4119 Boyce Road and disposed of at the Altamont Landfill located seven miles north of Livermore. Some solid waste collected in Fremont may also be disposed of at the Newby Island Landfill located in San Jose. The City has a long term contract with Allied Waste for ongoing waste disposal at the Altamont Landfill. According to the *City of Fremont General Plan EIR*, the Altamont Landfill has sufficient long-term capacity to accommodate the waste from its service area. A number of policies in the *City of Fremont General Plan* promote waste diversion in the City and with effective implementation of these policies, impacts to solid waste would be considered less than significant. The proposed project would be generally consistent with the *City of Fremont General Plan* and therefore would have a no impact on solid waste disposal.

5.6 Cumulative Impacts

CEQA Requirements

CEQA defines cumulative impacts as two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are substantial or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. An evaluation of cumulative impacts is required by CEQA when they are significant, but need not be as detailed as the discussion of project impacts. Cumulative conditions are defined as conditions in the foreseeable future with all approved, pending, and known planned development in place. The CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR discuss the cumulative impacts of a project where the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

The criteria for determining significance of cumulative impacts are the same as those that apply to the project-level analysis unless otherwise noted in the section, where other agency standards regarding cumulative analyses may apply. Where the combined

cumulative impact associated with the project's incremental effect and the effects of other projects is not significant, the EIR indicates why the cumulative impact is not significant and is not discussed in further detail in the EIR. Where the EIR identifies a significant cumulative impact, but finds that the project's contribution to that impact would be less than considerable, an explanation for that conclusion is provided.

According to the California State CEQA Guidelines section 15130 (a)(1), there is no need to evaluate cumulative impacts to which the project does not contribute. Relevant potential cumulative impacts to which the proposed project could contribute include: aesthetics and visual resources; air quality; geology, soils and seismicity; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; noise; public services and utilities; and transportation and circulation. Each of these topics is addressed herein.

Cumulative Impacts Analysis and Assumptions

Impacts associated with cumulative development were analyzed based on the proposed project's effects in combination with a summary of projections in the adopted *City of Fremont General Plan*, which was adopted on December 13, 2011. The *City of Fremont General Plan* anticipates a projected increase in the population from of 41,000 people from 215,000 people to 256,000 people by 2035. Development activity in Fremont over buildout of the General Plan over the next 20 to 25 years will largely consist of infill projects on smaller vacant and underutilized parcels since the majority of the City is largely developed. The *City of Fremont General Plan* also assumes that approximately 35,610 new jobs would be added to the City by 2035.

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

The proposed project is located within an already urbanized area of the City. Although implementation of the proposed project would allow for the intensification of development in the area with the construction of 18 residential units and renovation of the existing tennis and swim club, the proposed project would be designed to take into account the existing topography and vegetation in order to reduce visual impacts. In addition, compliance with the *City of Fremont Municipal Code* and *City of Fremont General Plan* would ensure that the proposed project does not introduce substantial light and glare, which would pose a hazard or nuisance. Future development in the City would be required to undergo design review, thereby ensuring that cumulative development would result in a less than significant cumulative impact.

Conclusion: The proposed project and future development within the City would be required to comply with the *City of Fremont Municipal Code* and *City of Fremont General Plan*, which would ensure that the proposed project does not contribute to cumulative light and glare in the City and surrounding areas. The proposed project includes features, which would ensure that it would result in a less than significant effect to the visual character of the project site and area, including siting new single-family homes into the natural slopes, screening homes from the street with the existing berm and mature trees, and using low profile roofs that further reduce the

mass of the dwellings on the adjacent urban development. The proposed project may affect approximately 200 trees in various locations of the project site with a potential for concentrated losses along the street frontage due to grading and access requirements of the proposed project. However, Mitigation Measure 4.1-1 would require preparation of a Tree Protection and Replacement Plan, which would require retention of all types of mature trees and limit changes of the character of the landscape of the project site. As mitigated, the existing setting together with the design features of the proposed project would minimize the project's cumulative contribution to aesthetics and visual quality, resulting in a **less than significant cumulative impact**.

Air Quality

Cumulative Construction Impacts

The project's construction-related emissions would not exceed any of the BAAQMD thresholds of significance with implementation of [Mitigation Measures 4.2-1a](#) and [4.2-1b](#). The BAAQMD has not established a significance threshold for cumulative construction emissions. However, due to the temporary nature of construction emissions, if the project's emissions would be less than significant based on the project-level thresholds of significance, it can be expected that the project would not be a cumulatively considerable contributor to a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, construction emissions associated with the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative air quality impacts.

Conclusion: As stated in the short-term construction impacts discussion, with implementation of BAAQMD control measures, construction-related air quality impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would result in a **less than significant cumulative impact**.

Cumulative Operational Impacts

The BAAQMD has not established separate significance thresholds for cumulative operational emissions. The nature of air emissions is largely a cumulative impact. As a result, no single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. The BAAQMD developed the operational thresholds of significance based on the level above which a project's individual emissions would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the Basin's existing air quality conditions. Therefore, a project that exceeds the BAAQMD operational thresholds would also be a cumulatively considerable contributor to a significant cumulative impact. As described above, the proposed project's operational emissions would not exceed BAAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, and PM. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project, in conjunction with related cumulative projects would not be cumulatively considerable. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

With regards to cumulative health risks and hazards, no other sources of air toxics are located within the 1,000-foot screening distance of the project site and the proposed

project not propose any uses that would be considered a significant source of air toxics. Therefore, the project would not be cumulatively considerable and a less than significant impact would occur.

Conclusions: The proposed project would not result in a significant air quality impact and is generally consistent with the *City of Fremont General Plan*. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the applicable air quality plan, and a **less than significant cumulative impact** would result.

Biological Resources

Cumulative development has the potential to impact species and habitats that would also be impacted by the proposed project, and thus there is some potential for cumulative impacts on these resources to occur. However, it is expected that most current and future projects will have to mitigate any significant impacts through the CEQA, Fish and Game Code 1602, or Clean Water Act Section 404/401 permitting process, as well as through the FESA and CESA consultation processes. In addition, regional conservation plans protect a number of sensitive resources in the region and provide for the long-term conservation of these resources. Examples of such conservation plans in the Bay Area include the Eastern Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) and the Eastern Alameda County Conservation Plan, which are both being implemented, and the Santa Clara Valley HCP/NCCP, which is in preparation. As a result, most projects in the region will mitigate their impacts on biological resources, minimizing cumulative impacts on these species.

Conclusion: With mitigation measures incorporated herein, the proposed project would not result in a cumulative considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on biological resources and a **less than significant cumulative impact** would result.

Cultural Resources

The project site does not contain any known archaeological, historical or paleontological resources. The proposed project would not combine with any other factors or projects and thus is not considered a significant cumulative impact to cultural resources due to the localized site specific nature of cultural resource impacts. Future development in the City would be required to evaluate potential effects of cultural resources, thereby ensuring that cumulative development would result in a less than significant cumulative impact.

Conclusion: No significant cumulative impacts are predicted relative to cultural resources. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less than significant cumulative impact** to cultural resources.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The geographic context for the analysis of impacts resulting from geologic hazards generally is site-specific, rather than cumulative in nature, because each construction project site has unique geologic considerations that would be subject to uniform site development and construction standards. As such, the potential for cumulative impacts to occur is limited.

Impacts associated with potential geologic hazards related to soil or other conditions occur at individual building sites. These effects are site-specific, and impacts would not be compounded by additional development. Development at the project site would be required to be sited and designed in accordance with the City's Building Code, General Plan, and findings from a design level geotechnical study prepared for the proposed project pursuant to [Mitigation Measure MM 4.5-1](#).

Development of cumulative projects in the vicinity of the proposed project could expose soil surfaces and further alter soil conditions, subjecting soils to erosional processes during construction. To minimize the potential for cumulative impacts that could cause erosion, all proposed construction projects are required to be developed in conformance with the provisions of applicable federal, state, county, and city laws and ordinances, including the city's Grading Ordinance. Adequate control of sedimentation and erosion must be incorporated into individual projects to address current legal requirements for control of erosion caused by stormwater discharges. The proposed project would be required to comply with the provisions of the NPDES permitting process and local implementation strategies, which would minimize the potential for erosion during construction and operation of the facilities. Compliance with this permit process, in addition to the City's Building Code and other legal requirements related to erosion control practices, would minimize cumulative effects from erosion.

Conclusion: Adherence to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations with respect to project design and construction would provide adequate levels of safety regarding geologic and seismic hazards. Adherence to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations would ensure the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts regarding soil erosion. As potential geologic impacts are evaluated on a site-specific basis during the environmental review process, the proposed project would have a **less than significant cumulative impact** in regards to geology and soils.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

Cumulative development has the potential to result in an increase of greenhouse gas emissions in the region. The proposed project would result in 1,057.93MTCO₂eq/year of operational-related emissions.

The City's greenhouse gas emission inventory estimate for 2010 was 1.99 million metric tons with a service population of jobs and residents of 304,489 people. Because of the broad context and setting of the potential impacts of contributing to global climate change, the assessment of project-level emissions would significantly affect the ability of the State to reach its AB 32 goals. This is identified within the Conservation Element of the *City of Fremont General Plan* and *EIR* as the context for reviewing the projects effects and global climate changes. The *City of Fremont General Plan* considered the projected increase in emissions from new growth through the year 2020. The proposed project is considered generally consistent with the *City of Fremont General Plan*. Therefore, as a development proposal consistent with the *City of Fremont General Plan* land use projections and

greenhouse gas emissions, the proposed project would not cause a cumulatively considerable projected increase in emissions and would not hinder or delay the ability of the State to reach the goal-levels set forth in the Scoping Plan.

Conclusion: The proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regards to GHG emissions and climate change. Therefore, the proposed project in combination with cumulative projects would be consistent with, and not hinder, the reduction strategies for meeting the goals of AB 32. Impacts in this regard would be **less than significant cumulative impact**.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Development within the project site is not anticipated to increase the total transport of hazardous materials within the City. The City as a whole would generate reasonably manageable quantities of waste, all of which would be regulated by federal, state and local statutes. The construction related hazardous waste disposal resulting from all development within the City could result in large amounts of lead, asbestos, and other hazardous materials. However, these hazardous materials would be disposed of in compliance with all pertinent regulations for the handling of such waste. The proposed project would not be a significant generator of hazardous materials. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Conclusion: Hazardous materials and substances highly regulated at the federal, state, and local levels. Impacts related to hazardous materials and hazardous substances are considered site-specific and are generally mitigated to less than significant levels on a project-by-project basis. Compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal laws that regulate, control, or respond to hazardous waste, transport, disposal, or clean-up would ensure that development in the region, which includes the project area, does not result in significant impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less than significant cumulative impact** in regards to hazards and hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Development of the proposed project would contribute to cumulative drainage flows and surface water quality impacts when combined with other growth and development in the area. However, the potential cumulative impact is mitigated through the project design, the relationship to City drainage master plans, and implementation of appropriate on-site and off-site drainage improvements. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to contribute significantly to cumulative impacts on flooding and drainage system capacities that might arise because of continued development within the region. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Conclusion: The proposed project would be required to implement NPDES and BMP measures to reduce potential water quality impacts. In addition, projects may require drainage improvements to be in compliance with the *City of Fremont General Plan*, *City of Fremont Zoning Ordinance* and/or *Municipal Code* standards.

Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative impact in regards to stormwater runoff and contamination impacts, with mitigation measures incorporated herein.

Noise

The proposed project in combination with other related projects (combined effects) could result in a significant noise impact. However, it must also be demonstrated that the project has an incremental effect. In other words, a significant portion of the noise increase must be due to the proposed project.

Conclusion: Noise sources associated with the proposed would include but not be limited to: children and adults playing outside (e.g. tennis, swimming, etc.), pets, amplified music, mechanical equipment, yard maintenance, and home repair. The proposed project would also generate a net of 415 vehicle trips per day to the project site that would use surrounding roadways and generate additional transportation noise. However, future noise sources from the proposed project would not be significant and therefore, the proposed project would subsequently result in a **less than significant cumulative impact**.

Recreation

The proposed project in combination with reasonably foreseeable development would result in the increased demand for recreational uses within the City.

Conclusion: The proposed project includes 7.85 acres of common open space area, which would serve the proposed project. The common open space area would include an interconnected network of trails and open space areas for informal sports activities in the center of the project site. The proposed project would exceed the City's park standards and therefore is not anticipated to result in an increased demand for neighborhood parks in the project vicinity. Cumulative development would be required to comply with City standards, as well. Therefore, cumulative impacts to recreation would be considered **less than significant cumulative impact**.

Transportation and Circulation

The proposed project in combination with reasonably foreseeable development would result in the increased daily traffic volumes throughout the City, which could affect the operation of. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 63 trips during the PM peak hour and 72 trips during the AM peak hour. Vehicle trip growth estimates are consistent with travel forecasts of the City of Fremont General Plan and CMP.

Conclusion: As the proposed project would result in less than 100 trips during the AM and PM peak hours, the proposed project is anticipated to result in a **less than significant cumulative impact** to the study roadway intersections based on cumulative volumes.

5.1 Alternatives

Introduction

Section 15126.6 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines) requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to describe and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to a proposed project. The purpose of the evaluation is to identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires an EIR to select and evaluate only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]). An EIR does not need to consider every conceivable alternative to a proposed project, nor is it required that an EIR consider alternatives that are infeasible. Rather, it must consider alternatives that could feasibly attain most of the project’s basic objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening any significant adverse environmental effects of the project. The EIR must evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives and provide sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project to foster informed decision-making and public participation. In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires that an EIR specifically evaluate the impacts associated with the alternative of “no project” to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project.

This chapter provides a brief description of the proposed project, project goals and objectives, and potentially significant project impacts, followed by a description and evaluation of each alternative selected for inclusion in the EIR. Finally, this chapter concludes with a comparison of the alternatives and identification of the environmentally superior alternative.

Project Summary

Project Characteristics

The proposed project is comprised of 18 single-family homes, which would be clustered primarily in the eastern portion of the project site around a common open space area. The proposed project also includes renovation of an existing private tennis and swim club, which would include retaining three of the existing 13 tennis courts; renovation of the existing clubhouse, swimming pool and spa and the construction of 3,540-square-foot childcare facility and 2,100-square-foot café for a total of 11,670 square feet. A pond would be constructed in the southwestern portion of the project site that would serve as a retention basin for stormwater runoff within the project site.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Consistent with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b), a clear statement of objectives and the underlying purpose of the proposed project can help the City develop a reasonable range of alternatives. Each alternative would be evaluated as to how well it meets the objectives of the project, as currently proposed. The project objectives include the following:

- Create a unique and model sustainable residential development that includes modern architectural style and green building features that conserve water, materials, and energy while establishing an aesthetic connection to the surrounding environment.
- Create a land use plan that supports retention and economic viability of recreational facilities.
- Incorporate new development in a manner that is sensitive to the existing neighborhood and natural features of the site, including retention of trees and open space.

Potentially Significant Project Impacts

Chapter 4 (Environmental Analysis) of this EIR describes the potential impacts of the proposed project. As identified in that chapter, the project would result in a number of potentially significant environmental impacts, some of which could be mitigated to a less than significant level. The following summarizes the proposed project's potentially significant impacts prior to implementation of mitigation measures::

- Aesthetics – Potential for substantial tree removal that alters the natural open character relationship of the project site to the surrounding Kimber Park Development along the contextual urban edge of Fremont.
- Air Quality – Construction of the proposed project would increase the short-term emission of air pollutants that could exceed established air quality standards.
- Biological Resources – Construction of the proposed project could result in the potential take of California Tiger Salamander or California Red Legged Frog during construction activities if precautionary measures are not taken; promote invasion by non-native species; result in tree removal, result in the injury or mortality of common bird species, raptors, and/or bat species.
- Cultural Resources - Construction activities associated with development within the project site could damage or destroy potentially significant unknown cultural resources, including historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources, and/or human remains.
- Geology and Soils – The proposed project could experience structural damage from seismic-related ground shaking and secondary events, such as liquefaction or landslides and pose a threat to the safety of people present within the area at the time. In addition, soils within the project site could result in subsidence or differential settlement, or be subject to expansion and contraction. These conditions could create structural damage. Construction activities associated with future development have the potential to result in an increase in short-term erosion.
- Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change – No potentially significant impacts were identified.

- Hazards and Hazardous Materials – The public and/or environment could accidentally be exposed to hazardous materials during construction of the proposed project.
- Hydrology and Water Quality – Proposed drainage could result in offsite erosion and the proposed project could result in the degradation of groundwater quality if the groundwater well at the project site is not protected during construction activities.
- Noise – No potentially significant impacts were identified.
- Recreation – No potentially significant impacts to recreation were identified.
- Transportation and Circulation – No potentially significant impacts to transportation and circulation were identified.

Project Alternatives

The alternatives discussion briefly identifies and describes a range of alternatives as developed by City staff that would feasibly attain most of the project objectives and would avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts of the proposed project including the following:

- Alternative #1 – No Project Alternative;
- Alternative #2 – Expanded Club Alternative (No Housing);
- Alternative #3 - Clustered Residential Alternative (Replacing Club); and
- Alternative #4 – Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club).

This section discusses the environmental impacts associated with each of these four alternatives as compared with the impacts resulting from the proposed project. The impact level of each of the alternatives (less, similar, greater) is noted in parentheses at the beginning of each comparison. [Table 5-1: Comparison of Project Alternatives to the Proposed Project](#) at the conclusion of this section provides a summary. This section also identifies the “environmentally superior” alternative.

Comparison of Alternatives

CEQA does not specify the methodology for comparing alternatives. However, the issues and impacts that are most germane to a particular project must be evaluated when comparing an alternative to a proposed project. As such, the issues and impacts analyzed in project alternatives vary depending on the project type and the environmental setting. Long-term impacts (e.g., visual impacts and permanent loss of habitat or land use conflicts) are those that are generally given more weight in comparing alternatives. Impacts associated with construction (i.e., temporary or short-term) or those that could be easily mitigated to less than significant levels are considered to be less important.

The alternatives analysis below compares each alternative to the proposed project according to whether it would have a mitigating or adverse effect for each of the environmental resource areas analyzed in this EIR.

Alternatives Analysis

Alternative #1 - No Project/No Build Alternative, operation of existing facility

Characteristics

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3) requires that a “no-project” alternative be evaluated as part of an EIR, proceeding under one of two scenarios: the project area remaining in its current state or development of the project site under its current zoning designation. Alternative #1 – No Project Alternative considers the environmental effects of not approving the proposed project and would include the continuation of the existing permitted land uses and zoning into the future. Under this alternative, the existing private tennis and swim club and undeveloped/open space area in the eastern portion of the project site would remain.

Comparative Analysis

Aesthetics and Visual Quality (less). Under Alternative #1 - No Project, the existing tennis and swim club would not be renovated with new uses and the 18 single-family homes and common open space area would not be constructed. Therefore, the project site would remain as an existing private tennis and swim club in the western portion of the project site with the eastern portion of the project site remaining as undeveloped/vacant land. The No Project Alternative would result in no change in environmental conditions beyond basic maintenance of existing facilities at the project site, which would be considered less of an impact in comparison to the proposed project.

Air Quality (less). The No Project Alternative would not result in short-term construction emissions and minimal long-term operational emissions consistent with activity levels prior to 2012. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in less impacts to short-term and long-term air quality impacts as compared to the proposed project.

Biological Resources (less). The No Project Alternative would eliminate potentially significant impacts to several special status plant and animal species. The No Project Alternative would also eliminate potential impacts to protected trees that could also be removed as a result of development activities within the project site. Although, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to biological resources with mitigation measures incorporated herein, the No Project Alternative would result in a decrease in impacts to biological resources in comparison to the proposed project and no mitigation required.

Cultural Resources (less). The No Project Alternative would eliminate potential damage to potentially significant unknown cultural resources, including historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources, and/or human remains that could result with construction of the proposed project. Although, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to cultural resources with mitigation measures incorporated herein, the No Project Alternative would eliminate potential impacts to cultural resources in comparison to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils (less). Impacts under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed project in that the project site could still be exposed to seismic ground shaking,

liquefaction, soil erosion, and expansive soils. However, future development as proposed by the proposed project would not be exposed to these geologic conditions. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not include grading activities, which would eliminate short-term soil erosion at the project site during construction activities. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in somewhat of a decrease in impacts from geology and soils in comparison to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change (similar). An increase in direct and indirect sources of greenhouse gas emissions associated with the proposed project would not occur under the No Project Alternative. However, the planned renovations of the club would not occur, including efficiency upgrades to the club. Although, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to climate change, the No Project Alternative would have potential for similar emissions of greenhouse gas emissions in comparison to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (less). The No Project Alternative would have slightly less impacts in comparison to the proposed project with respect to hazards and hazardous materials with a decrease in the potential for storage and use of hazardous materials within the project site. The No Project Alternative would also eliminate additional development within a designated fire hazard severity zone. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in a reduction of potential impacts in comparison to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality (greater). Under Alternative #1 - No Project, the potentially significant surface water runoff and water quality impacts due to construction activities and post-construction non-point source pollution associated with the proposed project would not occur. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would continue to have untreated runoff and effects on hydrology, drainage and water quality impacts in comparison to the proposed project with respect to hydrology and water quality and therefore greater impacts.

Noise (less). Under the No Project Alternative, construction activities associated with the proposed project would not occur and, therefore, adjacent sensitive receptors and future sensitive receptors would not be exposed to sporadic noise and vibration levels. Finally, there would be no increase in noise levels along surrounding roadways from an increase in vehicle trips associated with the proposed project uses. Although, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to noise, the No Project Alternative would not result in an increase in comparison to the proposed project, and therefore impacts would be considered less.

Recreation (similar). Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not add additional new residences and, therefore, would not increase demand for recreational uses. The private tennis and swim club would remain as is, but the common open space area would not be constructed. Therefore, under the No Project Alternative, there would be no new recreational facilities developed, but there would be decreased demand for new recreational uses in comparison to the proposed project and therefore impacts would be considered similar.

Transportation/Circulation (less). Under the No Project Alternative, additional vehicle trips to the project site would not occur. Operations of the existing facility would generate about 50 percent of the total daily trips and 40 percent of the PM peak hour trips. Although the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to transportation and circulation, the No Project Alternative would result in less trips to the project site in comparison to the proposed project and therefore impacts would be considered less.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

This alternative would generally not be consistent with the project's objectives.

Alternative #2 – Expanded Club Alternative (No Housing)

Characteristics

The Expanded Club Alternative includes enhancing the existing tennis and swim club with a multi-use facility of approximately 13,000 square feet (or 100 feet by 130 feet), which is the size of two regulation high school basketball courts side by side with typical perimeter space similar to a ClubSport facility, with the potential for volleyball/net sport on the project site. This alternative would require approximately 70 parking spaces per Section 8-22003 of the *City of Fremont Municipal Code* or approximately 23,000 square feet of parking lot. For the purpose of this analysis the gym and parking would replace two tennis courts northeast of the existing driveway that travels through the project site. Under this alternative, the remainder of the project site would remain undeveloped and the existing club would return to its previous operational levels prior to 2012.

Comparative Analysis

Aesthetics and Visual Quality (similar). The Expanded Club Alternative would result in similar impacts to aesthetics and visual quality with the construction of a larger gym facility at the project site and the construction of more parking spaces, which could result in additional tree removal and ornamental grass areas near the middle areas of the site. However, the remainder of the project site would remain as an undeveloped open space area. Architecturally, the facility's mass and height could be screened and incorporated into the interior of the site for compatibility with the surrounding structures and facilities. In comparison to the proposed project, this alternative would result in similar impacts..

Air Quality (slightly less). An Expanded Club Alternative would result in similar impacts operational air quality impacts and a slight reduction in short-term construction impacts due to a reduction of grading in the eastern portion of the project site. Overall, the Expanded Club Alternative would result in slightly less impacts to air quality in comparison to the proposed project.

Biological Resources (slightly less). The Expanded Club Alternative would result in slightly less impacts to special status plant and animal species and trees by concentrating development within and adjacent to the existing private tennis and swim club. Although, the proposed project would result in a less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated herein, the Expanded Club Alternative would result in a slight decrease in impacts to biological

resources in comparison to the proposed project by preserving the eastern portion of the project site as undeveloped/open space.

Cultural Resources (less). The Expanded Club Alternative would not eliminate potential damage to potentially significant unknown cultural resources, including historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources, and/or human remains caused by the construction of the proposed project. However, as expansion of the existing private tennis and swim club into a ClubSport type facility would likely occur within the footprint of an area that has previously been disturbed, the potential for uncovering unknown cultural resources would be considered less in comparison to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils (similar). Impacts under the Expanded Club Alternative would be similar to the proposed project in that the project site would continue to be exposed to seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, soil erosion, and expansive soils with development within the project site. The Expanded Club Alternative would therefore result in similar impacts to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change (similar). Impacts under the Expanded Club Alternative would be similar to the proposed project in that this alternative would also result in an increase in direct and indirect sources of greenhouse gas emissions. Although, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to climate change, this alternative would have similar impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (slightly less). The Expanded Club Alternative would result similar impacts with regards to the potential for storage of hazardous materials within the project site. The Expanded Club Alternative would also eliminate residential development in the eastern portion of the project site which is located within a designated fire hazard severity zone. Therefore, the Expanded Club Alternative would result in slightly less impacts in comparison to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality (similar). The Expanded Club Alternative would result in slightly greater impervious surfaces by constructing the club within the existing footprint of the private tennis and swim club and construction of a larger parking area to serve the club. Therefore, surface water runoff and water quality impacts under this alternative would be similar in comparison to the proposed project.

Noise (similar). The Expanded Club Alternative would result in a similar generation of noise during short-term construction activities at the project site. The number of daily trips to the project site would be similar to the proposed project and therefore, long-term operations would also be similar in comparison to the proposed project.

Recreation (less). Under the Expanded Club Alternative, residential uses would not be constructed that would result in increased demand for recreational uses. The project would extend general recreation opportunities, albeit at a private commercial facility. Therefore, this alternative would result in less impacts in comparison to the proposed project.

Transportation/Circulation (similar). The Expanded Club Alternative would generate approximately 65 percent of the average daily traffic and 50 percent of the PM peak hour traffic as the proposed project. This would result in similar impacts in comparison to the proposed project in that the amount of traffic would be similar to the current. Therefore, the Expanded Club Alternative would result in no change in comparison to the proposed project.

Consistency with Project Objectives

While generally consistent with the proposed project's objectives, objectives to develop housing would not be met and viability of operating a gym/ court facility is unknown at this time.

Alternative #3 - Clustered Residential Alternative (Replacing Club)

Characteristics

The Clustered Residential Alternative (Replacing Club) would be comprised of 18 residential units in a condo/townhouse style in the western portion of the project site in lieu of the existing swim and tennis club, which would be subsequently demolished. The proposed residential uses would be accessed via the existing driveway through the property. The residential units would be concentrated in one area, but farther from the property edges, and in the general location of the existing swim and tennis club.

Comparative Analysis

Aesthetics and Visual Quality (less). Under the Clustered Residential Alternative (Replacing Club), development would be clustered in the western portion of the project site and would include demolition of the existing tennis and swim club. This alternative would result in a less impacts in comparison to the proposed project in that tree removal and grading would be likely be significantly reduced and future residential development would be farther from the property edges. Therefore, this alternative would result in a reduction of impacts to aesthetics and visual quality in comparison to the proposed project.

Air Quality (less). Due to a reduction in the total amount of development and reduction in the grading under the Clustered Residential Alternative (Replacing Club), impacts to short-term and long-term operational air quality would be less in comparison to the proposed project due to reduced traffic levels. However, this alternative would result in an increase in demolition activities at the project site with demolition of the tennis and swim club. Therefore, this alternative would result in a similar range of impacts in comparison to the proposed project.

Biological Resources (less). The Clustered Development Alternative (Replacing Club) would result in less impacts to special status plant and animal species and trees by replacing the existing private tennis and swim club with residential development. Although, the proposed project would result in a less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated herein, the Expanded Club Alternative would result in a decrease in the range of impacts to biological resources in comparison to the proposed project by preserving the eastern portion of the project site as undeveloped/open space.

Cultural Resources (less). The Clustered Development Alternative (Replacing Club) would not eliminate potential damage to potentially significant unknown cultural resources, including historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources, and/or human remains caused by the construction of the proposed project. However, development would occur within the footprint of an area that has previously been disturbed as the private swim and tennis club. Therefore, the potential for uncovering unknown cultural resources would be considered less in comparison to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils (similar). Impacts under the Clustered Residential Alternative (Replacing Club) would be similar to the proposed project in that the project site could still be exposed to seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, soil erosion, and expansive soils. However, with compliance with the City's Building Code, the California Building Code, this alternative would result in similar impacts as compared to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change (less). Direct and indirect sources of greenhouse gas emissions would also occur under the Clustered Residential Alternative (Replacing Club). However, with elimination of the private tennis and swim club, emissions would be a net reduction of emissions from prior operations and significantly less than the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (slightly less). The Clustered Residential Alternative (Replacing Club) would result in slightly less impacts as compared to the proposed project with demolition of the existing tennis and swim club and the development of 18 residential units within the footprint of the existing club. Limiting development on the project site to only residential uses would result in a slight reduction in the storage and/or use of hazardous materials within the project site in comparison to existing conditions and to the proposed project. In addition, concentrating residential development within the developed portions of the project site would reduce the potential hazard for wildland fires in the eastern portion of the project site. Therefore, this alternative would result in slightly less impacts in comparison to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality (less). Clustered Residential Alternative (Replacing Club) would result in slightly less impervious surfaces by clustering 18 residential units within the footprint of the existing tennis and swim club. Surface water runoff under this alternative would therefore be less in comparison to the proposed project as it would include a reduction in the number of buildings, paving and other impervious surfaces. Although the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with mitigation measures incorporated herein, the Clustered Residential Alternative would result in reduction of impacts to hydrology and water quality in comparison to the proposed project.

Noise (slightly less). The Clustered Residential Alternative (Replacing Club) would result in a reduction of impacts from noise during long-term operations as compared to the proposed project. This alternative would result in 172 weekday trips to the project site compared to 415 trips with implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would result in a reduction of vehicle trips, which would subsequently result in less long-term noise upon implementation of this alternative. However, short-term noise levels would be

similar to the proposed project during construction activities. Therefore, this alternative would result slightly less impacts to noise in comparison to the proposed project.

Recreation (slightly greater). Under the Clustered Residential Alternative (Replacing Club), the existing private tennis and swim club would be replaced with clustered residential uses with private open space incorporated into each unit. The proposed common open space area with an interconnected trail network would not be constructed under this alternative. Overall privately operated recreational facilities would be diminished with this alternative. Therefore, this alternative would result in slightly greater impacts to recreation in comparison to the proposed project

Transportation/Circulation (less). The Clustered Residential Alternative (Replacing Club) would result in a reduction in the amount of traffic by approximately 503 trips during the weekday with demolition of the existing private tennis and swim club and construction 18 residential uses. Trips to the study intersections during the AM and PM peak hours as compared to the proposed project would be less. Impacts to the study intersections would continue to be less than significant, but this alternative would result in less impact in comparison to the proposed project.

Consistency with the Project Objectives

While generally consistent with the project objectives, this alternative would not be consistent with some of the objectives, specifically retention of recreational facilities.

Alternative #4 – Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club)

Characteristics

The Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would include nine single-family homes that would be dispersed on the perimeter of the project site. The Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would include construction of the common open space area and proposed renovations to the existing swim and tennis club (café and child care center).

Comparative Analysis

Aesthetics and Visual Quality (less). Under the Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club), the existing swim and tennis club would be preserved and renovated, but the amount of residential development would decrease from 18 single-family homes to nine single-family homes in comparison to the proposed project. This alternative would result in a less impacts in comparison to the proposed project in that tree removal and grading would be reduced by developing a smaller number of residential homes along the perimeter of the project site and preserving more areas as common open space. Therefore, this alternative would result in a reduction of impacts in comparison to the proposed project.

Air Quality (slightly less). The Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would result in a reduction of impacts to short-term and long-term operational air quality in comparison to the proposed project. Development under this alternative would likely

result in less grading than the proposed project and operational impacts would be reduced based on a reduction in the amount of vehicle trips to the project site. However, operational emissions would be similar. Therefore, overall air quality impacts under this alternative would be slightly less in comparison to the proposed project.

Biological Resources (slightly less). The Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would result in a reduction of impacts to special status plant and animal species and trees by developing a smaller amount of residential development along the perimeter of the project site. Although, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with mitigation measures incorporated, the Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would result in a decrease in impacts to biological resources in comparison to the proposed project by preserving more trees and open space in the eastern portion of the project site.

Cultural Resources (slightly less). The Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would not eliminate potential damage to potentially significant unknown cultural resources, including historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources, and/or human remains caused by the construction of the proposed project. However, with construction of nine homes versus 18 homes, the potential for uncovering unknown cultural resources would be slightly less in comparison to the proposed project due to a reduction in the amount of grading required under this alternative.

Geology and Soils (similar). Impacts under the Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would be similar to the proposed project in that the project site could still be exposed to seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, soil erosion, and expansive soils. However, with compliance with the City's Building Code, the California Building Code, this alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts as compared to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change (slightly less). Direct and indirect sources of greenhouse gas emissions associated with the proposed project would also occur under the Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club). However, due to a reduction in the number of vehicle trips to the project site, impacts under this alternative would be slightly less in comparison to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (slightly less). The Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would result in similar impacts as the storage and/or use of hazardous materials within the project site would be similar to the proposed project. However, by constructing fewer single-family homes along the perimeter of the project site, the potential for fire hazards would be less. Therefore, this alternative would result in slightly less impacts in comparison to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality (less). The Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would result in slightly less impervious surfaces by clustering nine single-family homes along the perimeter of the project site and preserving more common open space area in the eastern portion of the project site. Surface water runoff under this alternative would, therefore, be less in comparison to the proposed project as it would include a reduction in the number of single-family homes and driveways, which would

reduce the overall amount of impervious surfaces at the project site. Mitigation measures would continue to be required in order to reduce potentially significant impacts to short-term surface water hydrology. However, overall the Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would result in a reduction of impacts in comparison to the proposed project.

Noise (slightly less). The Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would result in slightly less impacts during short-term construction and long-term operations as compared to the proposed project with a reduction in the overall number of single-family homes. The Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would result in a reduction in the number of vehicle trips to the project site, which would subsequently result in a reduction of long-term operational noise levels. Therefore, this alternative would result in slightly less short-term and long-term noise impacts.

Recreation (less). Under Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club), the existing private swim and tennis club would remain and the common open space area would increase slightly with a reduction in the number of single-family homes. Therefore, this alternative would result in similar impacts in comparison to the proposed project.

Transportation/Circulation (less). The Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club) would generate approximately 86 net new average daily trips less than the proposed project for a total of 329 average daily weekday trips. Trips to the study intersections during the AM and PM peak hours as compared to the proposed project would be less. Impacts to the study intersections would continue to be less than significant, but this alternative would result in less impact in comparison to the proposed project.

Consistency with the Project Objectives

The proposed project would be generally consistent with the project objectives.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires that the environmentally superior alternative be identified. If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Alternative #1-No Project Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative as it would reduce impacts to aesthetics and visual quality, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and transportation and circulation compared to the proposed project. Among the other alternatives, Alternative #3-Clustered Residential (Without Club) would be considered the environmentally superior alternative, as it would reduce impacts related to aesthetics and visual quality, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gases and climate change, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and transportation and circulation. [Table 5.1-1.: Comparison of Project Alternatives to the Proposed Project](#) rates the impacts of the above alternatives compared to the impacts of the proposed project.

Table 5-1: Comparison of Project Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Environmental Category	Alternative #1 - No Project Alternative	Alternative #2 – Expanded Club	Alternative #3 - Clustered Residential (Without Club)	Alternative #4 – Reduced Residential Density Alternative (In Addition to Club)
Aesthetics and Visual Character	Less	Similar	Less	Less
Air Quality	Less	Slightly Less	Less	Slightly Less
Biological Resources	Less	Slightly Less	Less	Slightly Less
Cultural Resources	Less	Less	Less	Slightly Less
Geology and Soils	Less	Similar	Similar	Similar
Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change	Similar	Similar	Less	Slightly Less
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less	Slightly Less	Slightly Less	Slightly Less
Hydrology and Water Quality	Greater	Similar	Less	Less
Noise	Less	Similar	Slightly Less	Slightly Less
Recreation	Similar	Less	Slightly Greater	Less
Transportation and Circulation	Less	Similar	Less	Less
Ability to Meet Project Objectives	Less	Slightly Less	Slightly Less	Similar