

## 5.0 ALTERNATIVES

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) include a discussion of reasonable project alternatives that would “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6). This chapter identifies potential alternatives to the Ganahl Lumber Project (proposed project), located in the City of San Juan Capistrano (City), evaluates the potential impacts of each alternative, and compares the potential impacts of each alternative against the proposed project’s impacts, as required by CEQA.

Key provisions of the *State CEQA Guidelines* on alternatives (Section 15126.6[b] through [f]) are summarized below to explain the foundation and legal requirements for the alternatives analysis in the EIR:

- The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly (15126.6[b]).
- The specific alternative of “no project” shall also be evaluated along with its impact (15126.6[e][1]). The “no project” analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation is published and at the time the environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. If the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (15126.6[e][2]).
- The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by the “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making. Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent) (15126.6[f]).
- For alternative locations, only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR (15126.6[f][2][A]).

- If the lead agency concludes that no feasible alternative locations exist, it must disclose the reasons for this conclusion and should include the reasons in the EIR. For example, in some cases there may be no feasible alternative locations for a geothermal plant or mining project, which must be in close proximity to natural resources at a given location (15126.6[f][2][B]).
- An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative (15126.6[f][3]).

Pursuant to the guidelines stated above, a range of alternatives to the proposed project is considered and evaluated in this EIR. These alternatives were developed in the course of project planning and environmental review. The discussion in this section provides:

1. A description and analysis of impacts for each of the alternatives considered;
2. Comparative analysis of each alternative that focuses on the potentially significant unavoidable environmental impacts of the proposed project, e.g., agricultural and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (the purpose of this analysis is to determine whether alternatives are capable of eliminating or reducing the significant environmental impacts of the project to a less than significant level); and
3. Conclusions regarding the alternative's: (1) ability to avoid or substantially lessen the significant unavoidable impacts of the project; (2) ability to attain the project objectives (as stated below); and (3) merits compared to the merits of the proposed project.

## 5.2 PROPOSED PROJECT

### 5.2.1 Project Characteristics

As described earlier in Chapter 3.0, Project Description, the proposed project would involve the development of three separate development areas on the 17-acre site, described as Areas A, B, and C. Area A would include the potential development of two drive-through restaurants with a total building area of 6,000 square feet (sf). Area B would be developed with the Ganahl Lumber hardware store and lumber yard with a total building area of 161,385 sf. Area C would include a crushed-rock gravel area for short-term vehicle storage. The majority of the development would be concentrated within Area B.

### 5.2.2 Project Objectives

Each alternative is analyzed to determine whether it achieves the basic objectives of the proposed project. The underlying purpose of the proposed project would be to provide a high quality building supply store, restaurant uses, and continuation of a vehicle storage lot. As discussed in Section 3.3.11, Project Objectives, of Chapter 3.0, Project Description, of this EIR, the following project objectives have been established to aid decision-makers in their review of the proposed project and its associated environmental impacts:

1. Develop a lumber store that provides building supplies and hardware to professional contractors and the public, while also providing casual restaurant uses and automobile storage facilities.

2. Develop a project that balances the development potential of the project site with environmental considerations.
3. Revitalize the vacant site with a well-designed and landscaped mixed-use project that is compatible with the surrounding community.
4. Allow the continuation of parking/automobile storage for nearby car dealerships.
5. Increase the City's tax base generating revenue for the City through increased retail sales.
6. Invigorate the local economy by providing new employment and business opportunities in the City.
7. Provide an easement for future private emergency access from the project site to Avenida Aeropuerto along the westernmost boundary of the Capistrano Valley Mobile Estates (CVME).
8. Develop a project that will promote sustainability and energy efficiency, incorporating design features that would exceed the California's Title 24 Energy Code requirements.

### 5.2.3 Significant Unavoidable Impacts of the Proposed Project

As described in Chapter 4.0, Existing Environmental Setting, Environmental Analysis, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, the proposed project would not result in significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to aesthetics; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; energy; geology and soils; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; noise; tribal cultural resources; or utilities and service systems. In addition, as described in Chapter 2.0, Introduction, the project would have no impacts related to agricultural resources, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, and wildfire. However, as discussed below, the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable traffic impacts.

The following discussion focuses on alternatives that would reduce or avoid the significant adverse unavoidable impacts of the proposed project. The following is a summary of the impacts that are considered significant, adverse, and unavoidable after all mitigation is applied. These impacts are also described in detail in Chapter 4.0.

#### 5.2.3.1 Traffic

The project would result in conflicts with City Administrative Policy No. 310, which was adopted by the City for the purpose of establishing thresholds for determining traffic impacts. Specifically, the project would result in potentially significant impacts at two roadway segments (Stonehill Drive between Camino Capistrano and the project driveway and between the project driveway and Del Obispo Street) in the Existing Plus Project condition. As described in Section 4.12.8, in Section 4.12, Transportation, of this Draft EIR, no feasible mitigation is available to reduce the impacts on these two roadway segments. There is no available right-of-way along these roadway segments to construct improvements that would provide additional roadway capacity. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur at these roadway segments.

The proposed project would also result in potentially significant impacts at the same two roadway segments (Stonehill Drive between Camino Capistrano and the project driveway and between the project driveway and Del Obispo Street) as well as the intersection of Del Obispo Street/Stonehill Drive in the Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative and General Plan Buildout (2040) scenarios. No feasible mitigation is available to reduce the impacts on these roadway segments and the impacted intersection. As described above, there is no available right-of-way along these segments of Stonehill Drive to construct improvements that would provide additional roadway capacity. In addition, there is insufficient available right-of-way along Del Obispo Street and Stonehill Drive in the vicinity of the impacted intersection to construct improvements. Further, the impacted intersection is located within the City of Dana Point and mitigation cannot be enforced within another jurisdiction outside the City of San Juan Capistrano. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur at the intersection of Del Obispo Street/Stonehill Drive and two roadway segments (Stonehill Drive between Camino Capistrano and the project driveway and between the project driveway and Del Obispo Street).

### **5.3 ALTERNATIVES INITIALLY CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION**

Section 15126.6(c) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* suggests that EIRs identify any alternatives that were considered by the Lead Agency but were rejected during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the Lead Agency's determination. In evaluating an appropriate range of alternatives to the proposed project, a number of alternatives were considered and rejected for differing reasons by the City.

The following is a discussion of the development alternatives considered during the environmental review process and the reasons they were not selected for detailed analysis in this Draft EIR.

#### **5.3.1 Reduced Ganahl Lumber Store Project Alternative**

This alternative would have reduced the size of the proposed Ganahl Lumber store and lumber yard. Physical impacts under this alternative would have been reduced due to the smaller development area. A smaller Ganahl Lumber store would have reduced traffic and transportation impacts by reducing vehicle trips associated with the proposed project.

However, this alternative would not have achieved one of the stated project objectives, including increasing the City's tax base generating revenue for the City through increased retail sales to the same extent as the proposed project because a smaller hardware store and lumber yard would likely generate less sales tax. Additionally, a smaller Ganahl Store would not be economically viable and would not meet the needs of Ganahl Lumber to provide a wide range of building supplies. This is supported by the fact that the existing Ganahl Store, located approximately a half a mile south of the project site in Dana Point, is not sufficiently sized to stock many of the building materials and supplies that are requested by its customers. This is one of the key reasons why Ganahl Lumber is proposing to relocate and replace its existing Dana Point hardware store and lumber yard with a new facility at the project site in San Juan Capistrano.

### 5.3.2 Alternative Sites Considered

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focuses on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant impacts of the project. The key question and first step in the analysis is whether any of the significant impacts of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by relocating the project. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6[f][2][A]). Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, General Plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the project Applicant can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6[f][1]). If it is determined that no feasible alternative locations exist, the EIR must disclose the reasons for this conclusion (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6[f][2][B]).

#### 5.3.2.1 Ganahl Lumber Site in Dana Point

The project Applicant currently owns an approximately 1.5-acre site at 34162 Doheny Park Road in Dana Point, where it operates a hardware store and drive-through lumber yard. The existing Ganahl Lumber store in Dana Point is bordered by Doheny Park Road to the west, commercial uses to the south, a mobile home park to the north and east and is fully developed. As such, the existing Ganahl Lumber store cannot be expanded without acquiring and redeveloping one or more of the adjacent properties. It should be noted that several components of the proposed project (the drive-through restaurants and vehicle storage for the City's car dealerships) are required by the City as a condition of developing the project site, which is currently owned by the City. Therefore, for purposes of analysis, it is reasonable to assume those uses would not be developed on the existing Ganahl Lumber site or surrounding properties in Dana Point.

According to the City of Dana Point's Zoning Map, the adjacent properties to the south of the existing Ganahl Lumber store are located within the Community Commercial/Pedestrian (CC/P) District. According to Section 9.11.020(b) of the City of Dana Point's Zoning Code, the CC/P District allows building materials sales and service uses as a permitted use.

The City of Dana Point's Zoning Map indicates that the adjacent properties to the south of the existing Ganahl Lumber store are located within the Commercial/Residential (C/R) District. According to Section 9.13.020(c) of the City of Dana Point's Zoning Code, building materials sales and service uses are not permitted uses within the C/R District. Therefore, a Zone Change would be required to accommodate the development of an expanded Ganahl Lumber store and lumber yard on the mobile home park properties to the north and east of the Ganahl Lumber site in Dana Point. It is not clear whether an amendment to the City of Dana Point's General Plan would be required.

Given the fact that the properties to the south of the Ganahl Lumber site in Dana Point are currently developed with businesses that are still operating, and the properties to the north and east of the Ganahl Lumber site in Dana Point are developed with a large mobile home park that is presumed to be subject to long-term ground leases, it is not reasonable to assume that the project Applicant/Developer can acquire or control any of these adjacent properties in a timely fashion that would allow for the implementation of a project with similar uses and square footage. Further, as

discussed above, a Zone Change would be required to allow a building materials sales and service use on the properties adjacent to the Ganahl Lumber site in Dana Point. As noted above, the project Applicant/Developer would also not be required to develop drive-through restaurants and vehicle storage for the City of San Juan Capistrano's car dealerships in a neighboring city.

While development of the proposed Ganahl Lumber hardware store and lumber yard at the Ganahl Lumber site and adjacent properties in Dana Point could potentially reduce some of the proposed project's environmental impacts because it would result in reduced trip generation and related traffic, air quality, and noise impacts in comparison to the proposed project, many of the environmental impacts of this alternative would be similar to or greater than those of the proposed project, especially considering that the Ganahl Lumber site in Dana Point is bordered by sensitive residential uses to the north and east. The addition of drive-through restaurant space and vehicle storage would increase the potential environmental impacts at that location.

It should also be noted that development of an expanded Ganahl Lumber hardware store and lumber yard on the Ganahl Lumber site and surrounding properties in Dana Point would fail to meet most of the project objectives. Moving the proposed project to Dana Point would not revitalize the project site (Objective 3), increase the City of San Juan Capistrano's tax base (Objective 5), invigorate the local economy by providing new employment and business opportunities in the City of San Juan Capistrano (Objective 6), or provide an emergency access easement to Avenida Aeropuerto through the project site (Objective 7). This alternative may allow the continuation of automobile storage for nearby car dealerships in San Juan Capistrano on the project site (Objective 4); however, no improvements to the existing parking area on the project site would be provided.

Therefore, an alternative site at the Ganahl Lumber site and surrounding properties in Dana Point was not considered feasible because the project Applicant/Developer would be required to acquire additional properties in Dana Point, a Zone Change (and possibly a General Plan amendment) would be required, the Dana Point site would not achieve the underlying purpose and objectives of the proposed project, and development of an expanded Ganahl Lumber hardware store and lumber yard on the Ganahl Lumber site and surrounding properties in Dana Point would likely result in many of the same environmental impacts as development of the proposed project on the project site. Therefore, this alternative was rejected from further consideration.

#### 5.3.2.2 Other Properties within San Juan Capistrano

The City has reviewed the inventory of vacant properties that have the potential to support a similarly sized development. Due to the developed nature of the City, there are no available properties that are of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed project. The City is currently processing development applications on the few vacant or underdeveloped properties in the City that are large enough to potentially accommodate the proposed project (the proposed Farm Specific Plan property at the southeast corner of Del Obispo Street and Via Vermeulen, the proposed Tirador Residential Project at the terminus of Calle Arroyo). Furthermore, an alternative site smaller than the proposed location would not be economically viable and would not meet the needs of the project Applicant/Developer to provide a wide range of building supplies. This is supported by the fact that Ganahl Lumber is seeking to vacate its existing hardware store and lumber yard in Dana Point, which is located on a 1.5-acre site approximately 0.5 mile south of the project site, because it

no longer meets the company's business needs in terms of the amount of product inventory that it can keep on hand to serve its customers.

The project Applicant/Developer does not own or control any other property within the City that would be suitable for development of the proposed project. Moreover, the project Applicant/Developer cannot reasonably acquire or control an alternative site in the City in a timely fashion that would allow for the implementation of a project with similar uses and square footage.

In addition, development of the proposed project at an alternative site in the City (assuming one was available) could potentially result in some environmental impacts that would be similar to or greater than those of the proposed project's environmental impacts, depending on the proximity of the alternate site to sensitive uses or a circulation system where the existing level of service and roadway capacity could accommodate the proposed uses.

The development of the proposed project on an alternative site in the City would also fail to meet several of the project objectives. Moving the proposed project would not revitalize the project site (Objective 3), nor would it provide an emergency access easement to Avenida Aeropuerto through the project site (Objective 7). Moving the proposed project to another part of San Juan Capistrano would meet the project objective to provide automobile storage for the City's car dealerships (Objective 4); however, doing so would result in some operational inefficiencies because an alternate site would not be located as close to the City's car dealerships along Camino Capistrano.

Conclusion. For these reasons, no alternative site is considered feasible because the project Applicant does not own or control another vacant site in the project area, no suitable alternative site is available that would achieve the underlying purpose and objectives of the project, and an alternative site would likely not reduce environmental impacts as compared to the development of the proposed project on the project site. Therefore, no alternative locations to undertake the proposed project are analyzed in the Draft EIR. This alternative was rejected from further consideration.

## 5.4 ALTERNATIVES UNDER CONSIDERATION

Section 21100 of the Public Resources Code (PRC) and Section 15126 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* require an EIR to identify and discuss a No Project Alternative and a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts. Based on the criteria listed above, the following four alternatives have been determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives that have the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project but that may avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project. Therefore, the alternatives considered in this EIR include the following:

- **Alternative 1: No Restaurant Use.** This alternative would include the Ganahl Lumber store as proposed but would eliminate the 6,000 square feet (sf) of drive-through restaurant uses. This would result in no restaurant tenant and would reduce daily traffic trips to/from the site.

- **Alternative 2: 2,000 Square Feet of Restaurant Uses.** This alternative would include the Ganahl Lumber store as proposed but would reduce the square footage of the restaurant uses from 6,000 square feet (sf) to 2,000 sf. This would most likely result in one restaurant tenant and would reduce daily traffic trips to/from the site.
- **Alternative 3: 4,000 Square Feet of Restaurant Uses.** This alternative would include the Ganahl Lumber store as proposed but would reduce the square footage of the restaurant uses from 6,000 square feet (sf) to 4,000 sf. This would most likely result in one restaurant tenant and would reduce daily traffic trips to/from the site.
- **Alternative 4: No Project/No Development.** This alternative would involve no changes to the existing land uses and conditions on the project site. No development would occur on the project site and the existing condition of the site as vacant and undeveloped would not change.

For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that all of the alternatives would comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations, policies, and ordinances. Table 5.A, below, provides a summary description of each alternative and the basis for its selection for inclusion in the EIR. The environmental impacts associated with the three Build Alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, and 3) are thoroughly analyzed in the Project Alternatives section of each resource section in Chapter 4 of this EIR. The analysis for each of the Build Alternatives is specific and detailed enough to support their approval/adoption by City decision makers, should they elect to do so. The No Project Alternative (Alternative 4) is evaluated below.

In accordance with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(d), each alternative is evaluated in sufficient detail to determine whether the overall environmental impacts would be less than, similar to, or greater than the corresponding impacts of the proposed project. Furthermore, each alternative is evaluated to determine the extent to which the project objectives, identified in Chapter 3.0, of this Draft EIR, would be attained by the alternative. The evaluation of each of the alternatives follows the process described below:

1. The environmental impacts of the alternative are determined for each environmental issue area analyzed in Chapter 4.0, of this Draft EIR, assuming that each alternative would implement similar regulatory compliance measures, project design features, and mitigation measures as the proposed project.
2. Post-mitigation significant and non-significant environmental impacts of the alternative and the proposed project are compared for each environmental issue area as follows:
  - a. **Less:** Where the impact of the alternative would be clearly less adverse or more beneficial than the impact of the proposed project, the comparative impact is said to be “less.”
  - b. **Greater:** Where the impact of the alternative would clearly be more adverse or less beneficial than the proposed project, the comparative impact is said to be “greater.”
  - c. **Similar:** Where the impact of the alternative and the proposed project would be roughly equivalent, the comparative impact is said to be “similar.”
3. The comparative analysis of the impacts is followed by a general discussion of the extent to which the project objectives are attained by the alternative.



**Table 5.A: Summary of Project Alternatives**

Alternative	Description	Basis for Selection and Summary Analysis
Proposed Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximately 17 acres</li> <li>• Land use designation of Quasi-Industrial and Industrial Park</li> <li>• Zoning Designation of Commercial Manufacturing and Mobile Home Park Senior Overlay</li> <li>• Undeveloped and vacant in the existing condition.</li> <li>• Construction of two drive-through restaurants on two acres, the Ganahl Lumber hardware store and lumber yard on 10.6 acres and a crushed-rock gravel area for short-term vehicle storage on 4.4 acres.</li> <li>• 399 vehicle storage spaces to be used by local car dealerships on Area C, 165 parking spaces on Area B, and 62 parking spaces on Area A.</li> <li>• A utility easement to provide future emergency access to and from the project site to the north.</li> <li>• Total external (net new) trip generation of 3,486 ADT</li> <li>• A net import of approximately 18,000 cubic yards of material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preferred site within the City considered by the project Applicant</li> <li>• Meets project objectives</li> <li>• Refer to Chapters 3.0 and 4.0 of this Draft EIR</li> </ul>
Alternative 1: No Restaurant Uses Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximately 17 acres</li> <li>• Land use designation of Quasi-Industrial and Industrial Park</li> <li>• Zoning Designation of Commercial Manufacturing and Mobile Home Park Senior Overlay</li> <li>• 161,385 sf Ganahl Lumber hardware store</li> <li>• Elimination of 6,000 sf of drive-through restaurant use as compared to the proposed project.</li> <li>• Construction of a Ganahl Lumber hardware store and lumber yard on 10.6 acres and a crushed-rock gravel area for short-term vehicle storage on 4.4 acres.</li> <li>• Area A would provide 150 parking spaces, compared to 62 parking spaces provided in Area A as part of the proposed project.</li> <li>• Total external (net new) trip generation of 2,073 ADT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potentially inconsistent with some of the project objectives</li> <li>• Reduced physical environmental impacts due to elimination of drive-through restaurants</li> <li>• Results in fewer daily traffic trips than the proposed project</li> </ul>
Alternative 2: 2,000 Square Feet of Restaurant Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximately 17 acres</li> <li>• Land use designation of Quasi-Industrial and Industrial Park</li> <li>• Zoning Designation of Commercial Manufacturing and Mobile Home Park Senior Overlay</li> <li>• 161,385 sf Ganahl Lumber hardware store</li> <li>• Reduction of drive-through restaurant use as compared to the proposed project from 6,000 sf to 2,000 sf.</li> <li>• Construction of a Ganahl Lumber hardware store and lumber yard on 10.6 acres and a crushed-rock gravel area for short-term vehicle storage on 4.4 acres.</li> <li>• Area A would provide 80 parking spaces, compared to 62 parking spaces provided as part of the project.</li> <li>• Total external (net new) trip generation of 2,544 ADT trips</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potentially inconsistent with some of the project objectives</li> <li>• Reduced physical environmental impacts due to reduction of drive-through restaurant uses.</li> <li>• Results in fewer daily traffic trips than the proposed project</li> </ul>
Alternative 3: 4,000 Square Feet of Restaurant Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximately 17 acres</li> <li>• Land use designation of Quasi-Industrial and Industrial Park</li> <li>• Zoning Designation of Commercial Manufacturing and Mobile Home Park Senior Overlay</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potentially inconsistent with some of the project objectives</li> <li>• Reduced physical environmental impacts due to reduction of drive-through restaurant uses.</li> </ul>

**Table 5.A: Summary of Project Alternatives**

Alternative	Description	Basis for Selection and Summary Analysis
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 161,385 sf Ganahl Lumber hardware store</li> <li>• Reduction of drive-through restaurant use as compared to the proposed project from 6,000 sf to 4,000 sf.</li> <li>• Construction of a Ganahl Lumber hardware store and lumber yard on 10.6 acres and a crushed-rock gravel area for short-term vehicle storage on 4.4 acres.</li> <li>• Area A would provide 101 parking spaces, compared to 62 parking spaces provided as part of the project.</li> <li>• Total external (net new) trip generation of 3,015 ADT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results in fewer daily traffic trips than the proposed project</li> </ul>
Alternative 4: No Project/No Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued operation of the central and southern portions of the project site as a vehicle storage area.</li> <li>• Continued degradation of the project site from occasional use as an illegal dump site for trash and construction debris.</li> <li>• No grading or construction on the project site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required by CEQA</li> <li>• Potentially inconsistent with most project objectives</li> </ul>

ADT = average daily traffic  
EIR = Environmental Impact Report  
sf = square feet

A summary matrix that compares the impacts associated with the proposed project with the impacts of each of the analyzed alternatives is provided below in Table 5.B.

### 5.4.1 Build Alternatives

#### 5.4.1.1 Alternative 1: No Restaurant Uses

Alternative 1 would only partially meet the objective of developing a lumber store that provides building supplies and hardware to professional contractors and the public, while also providing casual restaurant uses and automobile storage facilities (Objective 1) because Alternative 1 would not include any restaurant uses. Alternative 1 would allow the continuation of parking/automobile storage for nearby car dealerships (Objective 4), provide an easement for future private emergency access from the project site to Avenida Aeropuerto along the westernmost boundary of the Capistrano Valley Mobile Estates (Objective 7), and include conservation and sustainability features to be consistent with the California's Title 24 Energy Code requirements (Objective 8). However, this alternative would not meet the objective of maximizing the potential of the project site to serve as a well-designed and landscaped mixed-use project that is compatible with the surrounding community (Objectives 3). Additionally, by eliminating the proposed drive-through restaurant uses, Alternative 1 would reduce the potential revenue generated for the City's tax base by reducing the amount of new retail sales on the project site, and invigorate the local economy less by providing fewer new employment and business opportunities in the City (Objectives 5 and 6) than the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would meet some of the project objectives, but not to the same degree as the proposed project.

**Table 5.B: Comparison of the Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project and Reduced Project Alternatives**

Impact Area	Proposed Project Impact with Mitigation (if any)	Alternative 1: No Restaurant Uses	Alternative 2: 2,000 Square Feet of Restaurant Uses	Alternative 3: 4,000 Square Feet of Restaurant Uses	Alternative 4: No Project/No Development
Aesthetics	Less than Significant <sup>1</sup>	Similar	Similar	Similar	Less
Air Quality	Less than Significant <sup>1</sup>	Less	Less	Less	Less
Biological Resources	Less than Significant <sup>1</sup>	Similar	Similar	Similar	Less
Cultural Resources	Less than Significant <sup>1</sup>	Similar	Similar	Similar	Less
Energy	Less than Significant	Similar (construction) Less (operation)	Similar (construction) Less (operation)	Similar (construction) Less (operation)	Less
Geology and Soils	Less than Significant <sup>1</sup>	Similar	Similar	Similar	Less
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Less than Significant	Less	Less	Less	Less
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less than Significant <sup>1</sup>	Less	Less	Less	Less
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less than Significant	Similar	Similar	Similar	Less
Land Use and Planning	Less than Significant	Similar	Similar	Similar	Less
Noise	Less than Significant <sup>1</sup>	Similar (construction) Less (operation)	Similar (construction) Less (operation)	Similar (construction) Less (operation)	Less
Transportation/Traffic	Significant and Unavoidable <sup>1</sup>	Similar (construction) Less (operation)	Similar (construction) Less (operation)	Similar (construction) Similar (operation)	Less
Tribal Cultural Resources	Less than Significant <sup>1</sup>	Similar	Similar	Similar	Less
Utilities and Service Systems	Less than Significant <sup>1</sup>	Less	Less	Less	Less

<sup>1</sup> Mitigation identified.

#### 5.4.1.2 Alternative 2: 2,000 Square Feet of Restaurant Uses

Alternative 2 would meet the objective of developing a lumber store that provides building supplies and hardware to professional contractors and the public, while also providing casual restaurant uses and automobile storage facilities (Objective 1). Alternative 2 would also allow the continuation of parking/automobile storage for nearby car dealerships (Objective 4), provide an easement for future private emergency access from the project site to Avenida Aeropuerto along the westernmost boundary of the Capistrano Valley Mobile Estates (Objective 7), and include conservation and sustainability features to be consistent with the California's Title 24 Energy Code requirements (Objective 8). However, this alternative would, to a lesser extent than the proposed project, meet the objectives of maximizing the potential of the project site to serve as a well-designed and landscaped mixed-use project that is compatible with the surrounding community, increasing the City's tax base generating revenue for the City through increased retail sales, and invigorating the local economy by providing new employment and business opportunities in the City (Objectives 3, 5 and 6) because it would not provide the same amount of restaurant space as the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would meet most of the project objectives, but not to the same degree as the proposed project.

#### 5.4.1.3 Alternative 3: 4,000 Square Feet of Restaurant Uses

Alternative 3 would meet the objective of developing a lumber store that provides building supplies and hardware to professional contractors and the public, while also providing casual restaurant uses and automobile storage facilities (Objective 1). Alternative 2 would also allow the continuation of parking/automobile storage for nearby car dealerships (Objective 4), provide an easement for future private emergency access from the project site to Avenida Aeropuerto along the westernmost boundary of the Capistrano Valley Mobile Estates (Objective 7), and include conservation and sustainability features to be consistent with the California's Title 24 Energy Code requirements (Objective 8). However, this alternative would, to a lesser extent than the proposed project, meet the objectives of maximizing the potential of the project site to serve as a well-designed and landscaped mixed-use project that is compatible with the surrounding community, increasing the City's tax base generating revenue for the City through increased retail sales, and invigorating the local economy by providing new employment and business opportunities in the City (Objectives 3, 5 and 6) by reducing the amount of the restaurant uses. Therefore, this alternative would meet most of the project objectives, but not to the same degree as the proposed project.

### 5.4.2 No Build Alternative

#### 5.4.2.1 Alternative 4: No Project/No Development Alternative

**Description.** Consistent with Section 15126.6 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the No Project/No Development Alternative assumes the existing land uses and condition of the project site at the time the NOP was published (May 22, 2019) would continue to exist without changes. The setting of the project site at the time the NOP was published is described throughout Chapter 4.0 of this EIR with respect to individual environmental issues, and forms the baseline of the impact assessment of the proposed project. The No Project/No Development Alternative represents the environmental conditions that would exist if no new development of any kind were to occur on the project site. The No Project/No Development Alternative anticipates that the project site would remain primarily as a vehicle storage area on the crushed-rock gravel surface area and vacant in the northern portion of the project site.

As previously stated, the existing General Plan land use designation for the project site is Quasi-Industrial and Industrial Park. The base land use designation of Quasi-Industrial and Industrial Park allows for a variety of light industrial and manufacturing uses, including limited regional commercial activities that are non-polluting and are compatible with surrounding land uses. The base land use designation of Industrial Park allows light industrial and manufacturing uses.

The existing zoning designation for a majority of the project site is Commercial Manufacturing (CM). The Commercial Manufacturing zone allows industrial and non-retail commercial uses, including wholesaling, limited manufacturing, eating establishments, and indoor recreational uses. The northernmost portion of the project site (where the northern access easement is proposed) is zoned Mobile Home Park Senior Overlay, which allows mobile home uses for seniors 55 years of age and older.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would allow for the existing vehicle storage uses on the project site to continue to operate as they currently do into the foreseeable future. There would be no improvements implemented on the project site. The No Project/No Development Alternative would allow existing conditions on the project site to remain unchanged.

**Environmental Analysis.** The project site is currently undeveloped and the northern portion of the site is vacant. A vehicle storage area, located on the central and southern portions of the project site, is secured by a chain-link fence. The vehicle storage area consists of a crushed-rock gravel surface and is not paved. The project site is occasionally used as an illegal dump site for trash and construction debris, which contributes to the degraded nature of the project site. This alternative assumes that the use of the project site as a vehicle storage area and occasional illegal dump site would continue into the future. It is assumed that no renovations or new construction would occur at the site.

The project site is generally bounded to the south by Stonehill Drive, to the west by San Juan Creek Channel and Trail, to the east by the BNSF rail line, and to the north by the Capistrano Valley Mobile Estates (CVME) mobile home park.

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the visual setting of the project site would not be altered. However, continued use of the project site as an occasional illegal dump site would continue to contribute to the degraded nature of the project site. No new air pollutant emissions or greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be generated by new visitors or short-term construction since no new construction is proposed. Unknown potential subsurface archaeological and paleontological resources would remain undisturbed. There would be no impacts related to geology, soils, and hazardous materials. There would be no change to the project site with regard to the percentage of the site that would remain pervious or the volume of runoff during a storm event and runoff treatment from best management practices (BMPs) that are included in the proposed project. The existing land uses would continue to be consistent with the City's General Plan and zoning documents, and no General Plan or Zoning Amendments would be required. No short-term construction noise impacts or long-term operational noise impacts would occur to the surrounding area. Further, no additional vehicle trips would be generated by construction or operations at the site, no new sources of solid waste would be created, and no increase in demand for energy would occur as a result of development.

**Overview of Potential Impact/Comparison to Proposed Project.** The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in any physical changes to the project site and there would not be a potential for new environmental impacts to occur. Overall, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer environmental impacts than the proposed project because no construction or development would be take place.

**Project Objectives.** The No Project/No Development Alternative would achieve only 1 of the 8 project objectives (the No Project Alternative would allow the continuation of parking/automobile storage for nearby car dealerships). Without the proposed project, the project site would not be developed with the proposed drive through restaurant and Ganahl Lumber hardware store and lumber yard uses. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not provide new employment opportunities within the City, nor would it expand the City's economic base.

## 5.5 IDENTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires the identification of an Environmentally Superior Alternative. *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(2) states that if the No Project Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative among the other alternatives. Table 5.B provides, in summary format, a comparison of the level of impacts for each Alternative to the proposed project.

The No Project/No Build Alternative has the least impact to the environment because it would not result in the development of the proposed project on the currently undeveloped site. While the No Project Alternative would lessen or avoid the impacts of the proposed project, the beneficial impacts of the proposed project—including the provision of new employment opportunities and improvements to the City's economic base—would not occur, and none of the project objectives would be met.

With the exception of the No Project/No Development Alternative, the Environmentally Superior Alternative would be Alternative 1, the No Restaurant Uses Alternative. This alternative would either lessen environmental impacts or result in impacts similar to those associated with the proposed project. Although Alternative 1 would achieve many of the project objectives—specifically the project objectives aimed at allowing the continuation of parking/automobile storage for nearby car dealerships (Objective 4), providing an easement for future private emergency access from the project site to Avenida Aeropuerto along the westernmost boundary of the Capistrano Valley Mobile Estates (Objective 7), and including conservation and sustainability features to be consistent with the California's Title 24 Energy Code requirements (Objective 8)—this Alternative would not maximize the potential of the project site to serve as a well-designed and landscaped mixed-use project that is compatible with the surrounding community (Objective 3). By eliminating the proposed drive-through restaurant uses, Alternative 1 would reduce the potential revenue generated for the City's tax base by reducing the amount of new retail sales on the project site, and invigorate the local economy by providing new employment and business opportunities in the City (Objectives 5 and 6). Therefore, this Alternative would meet some of the project objectives, but not to the same degree as the proposed project.