

5.0 ALTERNATIVES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

As described in Chapter 3.0, Project Description, in response to concerns raised by the California Coastal Commission (Coastal Commission) regarding the originally proposed Dana Point Harbor Hotels Project (Original Project), the Project Applicant has proposed modifications to the Original Project (Modified Project) that involve changes to the project design. Refer to Chapter 2.0, Introduction, of this Revised Draft EIR for additional background information on the Original Project, the CEQA process for the Original Project, and why modifications to the project design have been made.

The Modified Project would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts because all potential impacts can be mitigated to below the appropriate level of significance. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an 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). Because the Revised Draft EIR presents the Modified Project as the proposed project, this chapter identifies potential alternatives to the Modified Project and evaluates them as required by CEQA.

All impacts of the Modified Project can be mitigated to below a level of significance; therefore, the Modified Project does not have any significant unavoidable impacts. A lead agency is only required to prepare findings rejecting alternatives if one or more significant environmental effect will not be avoided or substantially lessened by mitigation measures (see *Laurel Hills Homeowners Ass’n v. City Council* [1978] 83 Cal. App. 3rd 515 [if mitigation measures substantially lessen a project’s significant environmental effects, the lead agency may approve the project without making findings on the feasibility of the EIR’s project alternatives]).

If the City of Dana Point (City) finds that a proposed project’s significant adverse effects will be avoided or substantially lessened by mitigation measures, it need not make findings that environmentally superior alternatives are infeasible (see *Mira Mar Mobile Community v. City of Oceanside* [2004] 119 Cal. App. 4th 477; *Protect Our Water v. County of Merced* [2003] 110 Cal. App. 4th 362, 373; *Kings County Farm Bureau v City of Hanford* [1990] 221 Cal. App. 3rd 692). Here this Revised Draft EIR does not identify any unavoidable significant adverse effects of the Modified Project, and also does not identify any unavoidable significant adverse effects. As such, the City will not make findings that the alternatives presented in this section are infeasible.

Analysis of a “no project” alternative to the Modified Project discussed in this section is provided for informational purposes and to allow the decision makers to consider the Modified Project in light of a hypothetical alternative land use scenario, thereby promoting CEQA’s purpose as an information disclosure statute.

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 an EIR:

- The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project that would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives 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 (NOP) 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 such a manner as 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]).

5.2 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES

Section 21100 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15126.6 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* require an EIR to identify and discuss a No Project Alternative and a reasonable range of alternatives

to a proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts. Based on the criteria listed above, the No Project Alternative, the Reduced Intensity Alternative, and the Mixed Use Alternative have been selected even though there are no significant impacts resulting from the Modified Project. These alternatives are outlined below:

- **Alternative 1: No Project Alternative.** This alternative would involve no changes to the existing land uses and conditions on the project site. Under this alternative, no new development on the project site is proposed, and therefore, no development would occur and the existing project site would remain in its current condition. The No Project Alternative would allow for the existing project site to remain developed with the Marina Inn and existing boater service buildings into the foreseeable future.
- **Alternative 2: Reduced Intensity Alternative.** This alternative would involve the development of a hotel use on the project site at a reduced intensity compared to the Modified Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative involves the replacement of the Marina Inn with Surf Lodge and the elimination of the top floor of the proposed Dana House Hotel (overall reduction of 26 rooms). Boater service facilities would be provided in Dana House Hotel, similar to the Modified Project, and designated boater parking would also be provided similarly to the Modified Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would have the same basic building footprint, architecture, open space areas, and vehicular access as the Modified Project. The development associated with this alternative would include the demolition of the existing structures. This alternative would be consistent with the existing land use designation and zoning districts on the project site.
- **Alternative 3: Mixed Use Alternative.** This alternative would involve the development of hotel and retail/restaurant uses on the project site. The Mixed Use Alternative involves the replacement of Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 square feet (sf) of retail and restaurant space and the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project. Boater service facilities would be provided at Surf Lodge or incorporated in the proposed retail/restaurant structure, and designated boater parking would continue to be provided on site. The development associated with this alternative would include the demolition of the existing structures. This alternative would be consistent with the existing land use designation and zoning districts on the project site.

Table 5.A provides a summary of the relative impacts and feasibility of each alternative. A complete discussion of each alternative is provided below.

Table 5.A: Summary of Project Alternatives

Alternative	Description	Basis for Selection and Summary Analysis
Modified Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate 13-acre overall project construction site, including the 9.16-acre site that includes the existing Dana Point Marina Inn, two boater service buildings, and boater parking Land use designation of V/RC and HML Zoning designation of DPHRP-ZC Construction of a four-story, approximately 71,590 sf structure providing 169 guest rooms (Surf Lodge). Amenities to include: lobby, fitness center, bars and lounges, restaurant, outdoor dining area, outdoor barbecue, accessory retail spaces, pool and spa, and guest laundry. Construction of a four-story, approximately 148,500 sf structure that includes a partially buried podium level, four floors of hotel rooms containing 130 market-rate guest rooms, and amenities (Dana House Hotel). Amenities to include: lobby, fitness center, meeting facilities, bars and lounges, restaurant, rooftop terrace, outdoor lawn area, pool and spa, and accessory retail spaces. Provision of approximately 6,800 sf floor space on the partially-buried podium level of Dana House Hotel including approximately 3,800 sf devoted as ancillary space for boaters (i.e., showers, lockers, laundry, and vending machines), with the remaining 3,000 sf dedicated to marina office/ meeting space. 526 parking spaces (including designated boater parking) provided in surface parking lots and within the podium level of Dana House Hotel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use designation and zoning district are compatible with the proposed uses and intensities. Meets all of the project objectives. Refer to Chapters 3.0 and 4.0 of this Revised Draft EIR for further Project Description details.
Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate 9.16-acre project site, including the existing Dana Point Marina Inn, two boater service buildings, and boater parking Land use designation of V/RC and HML Zoning designation of DPHRP-ZC Site would continue to remain developed with the Dana Point Marina Inn and two Boater Services Buildings with surface parking reserved for boaters on the southern portion of the project site. No demolition, grading, or construction would occur at the project site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The No Project/No Development Alternative is required by CEQA. Inconsistent with most project objectives.
Alternative 2: Reduced Intensity Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate 13-acre overall project construction site, including the 9.16-acre site that includes the existing Dana Point Marina Inn, two boater service buildings, and boater parking Land use designation of V/RC and HML Zoning designation of DPHRP-ZC Construction of a four-story, approximately 71,590 sf structure providing 162 guest rooms (Surf Lodge). Amenities to include: lobby, fitness center, bars and lounges, restaurant, outdoor dining area, outdoor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use designation and zoning district are compatible with the proposed uses. Does not fully meet all of the project objectives. Fewer physical environmental impacts due to elimination of 26 hotel rooms and reduced building area. Results in fewer daily traffic trips

Table 5.A: Summary of Project Alternatives

Alternative	Description	Basis for Selection and Summary Analysis
	<p>barbecue, accessory retail spaces, pool and spa, and guest laundry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a three-story, approximately 125,340 sf structure that includes a partially buried podium level, three floors of hotel rooms containing 104 market-rate guest rooms, and amenities (Dana House Hotel). Amenities to include: lobby, fitness center, meeting facilities, signature restaurant, rooftop terrace, outdoor lawn area, courtyard with fireplace, bocce ball court, pool, spa, and showers, and accessory retail space). • Provision of approximately 6,800 sf floor space on the partially-buried podium level including approximately 3,800 sf devoted as ancillary space for boaters (i.e., showers, lockers, laundry, and vending machines), with the remaining 3,000 sf dedicated to marina office/meeting space. • Parking spaces (including designated boater parking) provided in surface parking lots and within the podium level. 	<p>than the Modified Project.</p>
<p>Alternative 3: Mixed Use Alternative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximate 13-acre overall project construction site, including the 9.16-acre site that includes the existing Dana Point Marina Inn, two boater service buildings, and boater parking • Land use designation of V/RC and HML • Zoning designation of DPHRP-ZC • Construction of a four-story, approximately 53,797 sf structure providing 163 guest rooms (Surf Lodge). Amenities to include: lobby, fitness center, bars and lounges, restaurant, business areas, outdoor dining area, outdoor barbecue and yard, accessory retail spaces, pool and spa, and guest laundry. • Provision of 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. • Parking spaces (including designated boater parking) provided in surface parking lots and within the podium level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use designation and zoning district are compatible with the proposed uses. • Potentially consistent with some of the project objectives. • Results in fewer daily traffic trips than the Modified Project.

Source: LSA (March 2025).

ADT = average daily traffic

DPHRP-ZC = Dana Point Harbor Revitalization Plan and District Regulations Zoning Code

EIR = Environmental Impact Report

HML = Harbor Marine Land

sf = square foot/feet

V/RC = Visitor/Recreation Commercial

For each alternative, the analysis provides the following:

- Description of the alternative;
- Environmental analysis of the potential impacts of the alternative and the significance of those impacts (per the *State CEQA Guidelines*, significant effects of an alternative shall be discussed but in less detail than those of the Modified Project);
- Overview of the potential impacts of the alternative and the significance of those impacts; and
- Summary comparison of the alternative relative to the Modified Project's impacts, specifically addressing whether the alternative would meet the project objectives, eliminate or reduce impacts as compared to the Modified Project, and other comparative merits.

5.3 ALTERNATIVES INITIALLY CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

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 the Alternatives section of this Revised Draft EIR.

5.3.1 Original Project

As discussed throughout this Revised Draft EIR, the originally proposed Dana Point Harbor Hotels Project (Original Project) proposed to construct two hotels (Dana House Hotel and Surf Lodge) within the project site, located at 24800 Dana Point Harbor Drive, near the intersection of Island Way and Dana Point Harbor Drive in Dana Point. The Original Project involved the demolition of the existing Dana Point Marina Inn, two boater service buildings, and parking areas on the project site and included the development of two hotels, one of which would include space for boater services, associated ancillary hotel uses, and replacement of parking areas, including designated boater and hotel parking. Also included in the Original Project were associated infrastructure improvements necessary to facilitate pedestrian and vehicular access to and from the project site, landscaping improvements, and utility upgrades necessary to implement the Original Project.

Dana House Hotel was proposed as a boutique hotel including 130 market-rate rooms and associated amenities, including a lobby, fitness center, meeting facilities, signature restaurant, rooftop terrace, outdoor lawn area, courtyard with fireplace, bocce ball court, pool, spa, and showers, and accessory retail space.

Surf Lodge was proposed as an affordable hotel including 139 rooms, three of which would be developed as dorm-style rooms, and associated amenities, such as a lobby, fitness center, communal kitchen, rooftop terrace/bar, indoor recreation area, ground floor lounge/bar, pool, spa, and market.

A Draft EIR evaluating the Original Project (2021 Draft EIR) was prepared in 2021 and was circulated for public review for a period of 45 days, from April 30, 2021, through June 14, 2021, as required by CEQA. Prior to the approval of the Original Project by the City, the California Coastal Commission

(Coastal Commission) deemed the Original Project inconsistent with established parameters for lower-cost overnight accommodations cited in a Notice of Incomplete Application prepared by the Coastal Commission on December 14, 2022. Subsequently, at its June 2024 meeting, the Coastal Commission approved a Zone Text Amendment and Local Coastal Program Amendment (ZTA/LCPA) with suggested modifications that would not allow the development proposed as part of the Original Project. The Dana Point City Council accepted the suggested modifications and the certification of the ZTA/LCPA, as modified, is now final (February 5, 2025). Therefore, the Original Project would not meet requirements set forth by the Coastal Commission, which retains appeal jurisdiction for Coastal Development Permits issued by the City, and therefore is not viable for consideration as an alternative to the Modified Project. The Original Project has been rejected and is not considered further in the alternatives analysis.

5.3.2 Alternative Sites Considered

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on project alternatives or locations that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant impacts of a proposed 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 developments or 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]). 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]).

Locating the Modified Project on another site within the City of Dana Point (City) would most likely achieve most of the stated project objectives, including developing two hotels offering a mix of market-rate and affordable overnight accommodations that would be accessible to visitors characterized by a range of income levels; invigorating the local economy by providing new employment opportunities in the City; and increasing the City's tax base generating revenue for the City through increased transient occupancy and sales taxes. However, locating the Modified Project on another site outside of the Dana Point Harbor would not meet the project objective of implementing the planned revitalization of the Dana Point Harbor contemplated and authorized through the City of Dana Point's adoption and the California Coastal Commission's certification of the Dana Point Harbor Revitalization Plan & District Regulations (DPHRP&DR).

As stated in the *State CEQA Guidelines* (Section 15126.6[f][2]), "...The key questions and first step in analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or lessen any of the significant effects need to be considered for inclusion in the EIR."

Property Within City Limits. A City review process was conducted to determine whether alternative sites were potentially viable. The analysis of alternative sites included an assessment of sites in the City that would also be suitable for the development of the Modified Project. Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* (Section 15126.6[f][1]), the following factors were used to assess the feasibility of available alternative sites: suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, General Plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent could reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site.

The City has reviewed the inventory of vacant properties that have the potential to support a similarly sized hotel development within and outside of the Dana Point Harbor. Given the developed nature of the City, the results of the search within the City limits did not yield any properties that would be suitable in terms of size and availability. Additionally, overnight visitor accommodations are not permitted in other Planning Areas identified in the DPHRP&DR. Pursuant to the CEQA feasibility factors, no alternative sites were identified as potentially feasible alternative sites. Therefore, off-site alternatives have been rejected and are not considered further in the alternatives analysis.

5.4 PROPOSED PROJECT

5.4.1 Project Characteristics

As described earlier in Chapter 3.0, Project Description, the Modified Project, would construct two hotels (Dana House Hotel and Surf Lodge) located at 24800 Dana Point Harbor Drive, near the intersection of Island Way and Dana Point Harbor Drive. The Modified Project involves the demolition of the existing Dana Point Marina Inn, two boater service buildings, and parking areas on the project site and includes the development of two hotels, one of which would include space for boater services, associated ancillary hotel uses, and replacement of parking areas, including designated boater and hotel parking. Also included in the Modified Project are associated infrastructure improvements necessary to facilitate pedestrian and vehicular access to and from the project site, landscaping improvements, and utility upgrades necessary to implement the Modified Project. Dana House Hotel would be designed as a boutique hotel including 130 market-rate rooms and associated amenities. Surf Lodge would be an affordable hotel that includes 169 rooms and associated amenities. Chapter 3.0 provides additional descriptive information regarding the Modified Project and includes figures showing the site layout and proposed building elevations.

5.4.2 Project Objectives

Each alternative is analyzed to determine whether it achieves the basic objectives of the Modified Project. The underlying purpose of the Modified Project would be to provide a hotel development project of superior quality and design as part of the overall revitalization of Dana Point Harbor. As stated in Chapter 3.0, the City and the Project Applicant have established the following intended specific project objectives that would serve to aid decision makers in their review of the Modified Project and its associated environmental impacts:

1. Develop two hotels offering a mix of market-rate and affordable overnight accommodations that would be accessible to visitors characterized by a range of income levels.
2. Develop a project that balances the development potential of the project site with environmental considerations.
3. Revitalize the site with a well-designed and landscaped hotel project that is compatible with the surrounding community and planned revitalization of the Dana Point Harbor.

4. Maximize the City's tax base generating revenue for the City through increased transient occupancy and sales taxes, while balancing the provision of retail and restaurant land uses within the project site and Commercial Core based on the economic demand for such uses.
5. Invigorate the local economy by providing new employment opportunities in the City.
6. Develop a project that will promote sustainability and energy efficiency, incorporating design features that would exceed California's Title 24 Energy Code requirements.
7. Provide enhanced facilities for boaters and maintain boater designated parking in close proximity to the boat slips they serve.

As described in Chapter 4.0, Existing Environmental Setting, Environmental Analysis, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, the Modified 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; noise; land use and planning; public services and utilities; or transportation/traffic. For the purpose of this alternatives analysis, it is assumed that all of the alternatives would comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations, policies, and ordinances. It is also assumed that all mitigation measures required for implementation of the Modified Project would apply to the project alternatives and that similar reductions in impacts would be achieved through such mitigation. Therefore, the following discussion focuses on the ability of the alternatives to further reduce or lessen project impacts and the potential impacts of the project alternatives related to these issues.

5.5 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

5.5.1 Description

Consistent with Section 15126.6 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the No Project Alternative assumes the existing land uses and condition of the project site at the time the Supplemental Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published (July 2024) would continue to exist without any changes. The setting of the project site at the time the Supplemental NOP was published is described throughout Chapter 4.0 of this Revised Draft EIR with respect to individual environmental issues and forms the baseline of the impact assessment of the Modified Project. The No Project Alternative represents the environmental conditions that would exist if no new development of any kind were to occur on the project site.

As previously stated, the existing General Plan land use designation for the project site is Visitor/Recreation Commercial (V/RC) and Harbor Marine Land (HML). The land use designation of V/RC provides for primarily visitor-serving uses, such as restaurant, resort hotels and motel uses, commercial, recreation specialty and convenience retail goods and services. The HML designation provides for land-based harbor uses such as marinas, marine-oriented commercial and industrial services, marine-oriented governmental facilities and services, visitor-serving commercial uses, open space uses, and community facilities. The existing zoning designation for the project site is Dana Point Harbor Revitalization Plan and District Regulations (DPHRP-ZC), which allows uses as specified in the DPHRP&DR.

The No Project Alternative would allow for the existing project site to remain developed with the Marina Inn, existing boater service buildings, and surface parking into the foreseeable future. No demolition or new construction would occur on site. The approved General Plan (V/RC and HML) and zoning (DPHRP-ZC) designations would remain applicable to the project site although there would be no improvements implemented on the project site. The No Project Alternative would allow existing conditions on the project site to remain unchanged.

5.5.2 Environmental Analysis

5.5.2.1 Aesthetics

The No Project Alternative would not require any grading, site work, or removal of vegetation because no new development would occur on the project site. In addition, no buildings would be constructed on the project site. As such, this alternative would result in no impacts to scenic vistas. The project site is currently developed with the Marina Inn and existing boater service buildings, which produce light and glare from the on-site lighting. However, because the No Project Alternative would not include construction activities, construction of new buildings, or intensification of the on-site lighting sources, the No Project Alternative would not result in new impacts related to visual character or quality, or light and glare. Although the Modified Project would result in less than significant impacts related to aesthetics, because no development would occur on site, aesthetic impacts under the No Project Alternative would be less than the Modified Project.

5.5.2.2 Air Quality

The No Project Alternative would not require grading or construction and would not change or increase the intensity of the existing on-site use or increase vehicle trips to and from the project site. Therefore, no additional air pollutant emissions related to grading, construction, additional vehicle trips, and operational uses would be generated under this alternative, and no air quality impacts would occur. As compared to the Modified Project, no new construction or operational emissions would occur. Therefore, although the Modified Project would result in less than significant air quality impacts, the No Project Alternative's impacts on air quality would be less than the air quality impacts associated with the Modified Project.

5.5.2.3 Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would not require any grading or site work because no new development would occur on the project site. In addition, no buildings would be constructed on the project site. Therefore, the Modified Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Further, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to disrupt human remains or result in the discovery of previously unknown archaeological resources. No impacts related to cultural resources would occur under this alternative. Therefore, although the Modified Project would result in less than significant impacts to cultural resources, the No Project Alternative's impacts on cultural resources would be less than the Modified Project as no disturbance would occur on the project site.

5.5.2.4 Energy

The No Project Alternative would not require any grading or site work because no new development would occur on the project site. In addition, no new buildings would be constructed on the project site and no increased operations would occur. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not increase energy demand on the project site over existing conditions. However, the No Project Alternative would continue to operate the Dana Point Marina Inn with less efficient energy facilities as compared to the current energy efficiency standards required for new buildings by current Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Although the Modified Project would result in less than significant energy impacts, overall, the No Project Alternative's impacts on energy would be less than that of the Modified Project, which would increase the number of rooms and amenities on the project site, resulting in an increase in the energy demand.

5.5.2.5 Geology and Soils

The No Project Alternative would not require any grading or site work because no new development would occur on the project site. In addition, no buildings would be constructed on the project site and no increased operations would occur. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impacts related to geology and soils. The Modified Project would result in less than significant geology and soils impacts with mitigation incorporated; the No Project Alternative would not require any mitigation measures and its impacts on geology and soils would be less than those associated with the Modified Project.

5.5.2.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The No Project Alternative would not require any grading or site work because no new development would occur on the project site. In addition, no buildings would be constructed on the project site and no increased operations would occur. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not increase greenhouse gas emissions from new on-site uses or additional vehicle trips. No impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions would occur. Therefore, although the Modified Project would result in less than significant greenhouse gas impacts, the No Project Alternative's impacts on greenhouse gas emissions would be less than those of the Modified Project.

5.5.2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The No Project Alternative would not require any grading or site work because no new development would occur on the project site. In addition, no buildings would be constructed on the project site and no increased operations would occur. Because no construction activities would occur, no construction impacts related to hazardous materials would occur. The project site would remain developed with the Marina Inn and existing boater service buildings. Small amounts of hazardous materials may continue to be used on the project site; however, the No Project Alternative would not increase the use of hazardous materials because the on-site uses would remain the same. Therefore, no new hazards or hazardous material impacts would occur. The Modified Project would result in less than significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts with mitigation incorporated; the No Project Alternative would not require any mitigation measures and its impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than the impacts associated with the Modified Project.

5.5.2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

The No Project Alternative would not require any grading or site work because no new development would occur on the project site. Therefore, no soil disturbance would occur under this alternative and there would be no construction impacts on water quality. The No Project Alternative would not change impervious surface areas, add new uses or structures, or change stormwater runoff on the project site compared to existing conditions. Therefore, no new hydrology and water quality impacts would occur. However, the current project site includes few Best Management Practices (BMPs) or design features related to drainage and water quality as required by the current National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and other applicable regulations of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the County Municipal Code, and the City Municipal Code. Although existing on-site facilities would not be brought up to date with current water quality regulations, the No Project Alternative's impacts would be less than those of the Modified Project, as no new development would occur on site requiring grading and soil disturbance. The Modified Project would result in less than significant hydrology and water quality impacts, and overall, the No Project Alternative's impacts would be less than those of the Modified Project.

5.5.2.9 Land Use and Planning

No development would occur on the project site under the No Project Alternative. The project site would remain developed with the Marina Inn, existing boater service buildings, and surface parking lots. The No Project Alternative would not require a Zone Text Amendment (ZTA) to the DPHRP&DR to address the reapportioned land use categories as required under the Modified Project. However, the No Project Alternative would not be consistent with the City's goals or the planned revitalization of the Dana Point Harbor. Therefore, overall impacts to land use would be similar for the No Project Alternative as compared to the Modified Project.

5.5.2.10 Noise

The No Project Alternative would not involve any grading, construction vehicle, or truck trips. Therefore, the noise impacts that are typically associated with grading and construction would not occur under this alternative. Because no additional development would be constructed under the No Project Alternative and vehicle trips would not increase from existing uses, there would be no long-term operational increase in noise levels. Therefore, no new noise impacts would occur. Although the Modified Project would result in less than significant noise impacts, the No Project Alternative's impacts would be less than those of the Modified Project.

5.5.2.11 Public Services

No development would occur on the project site under the No Project Alternative. The project site would remain developed with the Marina Inn, existing boater service buildings, and surface parking. The No Project Alternative would not result in an increase in demand for fire protection and emergency services or police protection services because no additional uses would be developed on the project site. Therefore, no new public service impacts would occur. The Modified Project would result in less than significant impacts to public services with mitigation incorporated; the No Project Alternative would not require any mitigation measures and its impacts related to public services would be less than those of the Modified Project.

5.5.2.12 Transportation

The No Project Alternative would not require any grading or site work because no new development would occur on the project site. In addition, no new buildings would be constructed on the project site and the project site would remain developed with the Marina Inn, existing boater service buildings, and surface parking lots. The No Project Alternative would not increase vehicle trips to and from the project site over existing conditions. Therefore, no traffic impacts would occur, and the No Project Alternative's impacts would be less than those of the Modified Project.

5.5.2.13 Tribal Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would not require any grading, site work, or removal of vegetation because no new development would occur on the project site. In addition, no new buildings would be constructed on the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined by CEQA that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) or a local register. Further, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to disrupt human remains or result in the discovery of previously unknown tribal cultural resources. No impacts related to tribal cultural resources would occur. Although the Modified Project would result in less than significant impacts to tribal cultural resources, the No Project Alternative's impacts would be less than those of the Modified Project.

5.5.2.14 Utilities and Service Systems

The No Project Alternative would not include any new development on the project site and would therefore not increase the demand for or require any enhancement or new construction of public facility infrastructure for electricity, natural gas, water, or telecommunications over existing demand. Additionally, because no construction would occur and there would be no new or expanded uses on the project site, no increase in solid waste or wastewater generation would occur. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impacts on utilities and service systems. However, the No Project Alternative would continue operations of the Dana Point Marina Inn and would not be subject to the South Coast Water District's (SCWD) current water conservation requirements or energy efficient standards per Title 24, which are intended to reduce demand on public facility infrastructure. Although existing on-site facilities would not be brought up to date with current water conservation, solid waste reduction, or energy efficiency regulations, the No Project Alternative's impacts would be less than those of the Modified Project, as no new development would occur on site requiring public infrastructure for utilities or service systems.

5.5.3 Overview of Potential Impact/Comparison to Modified Project

Under the No Project Alternative, no physical changes would occur on the project site and there would not be a potential for new environmental impacts to occur. Overall, the No Project Alternative would result in fewer environmental impacts than the Modified Project because the site would remain in its current condition and no construction activities or increase in long-term operations would occur.

5.5.4 Attainment of Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the seven project objectives. Without the Modified Project, the project site would not be redeveloped with a hotel project that is compatible with the surrounding community and implements a portion of the revitalization planned in the DPHRP&DR. Further, the No Project Alternative would not help the City achieve its goal of providing a mix of market-rate and affordable overnight accommodations that would be accessible to visitors characterized by a range of income levels. No new facilities for boaters would be developed under the No Project Alternative. This alternative would also not provide new employment opportunities within the City, nor would it increase the City's tax base.

5.6 ALTERNATIVE 2: REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

5.6.1 Description

This alternative would involve the development of hotel uses on the project site at a reduced intensity (fewer rooms) as compared to the Modified Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative involves the replacement of Marina Inn with construction of Surf Lodge and the elimination of the top floor of the proposed Dana House Hotel (a reduction of 30 rooms). Boater service facilities would be provided in Dana House Hotel, similar to the Modified Project, and designated boater parking would also be provided similarly to the Modified Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would have the same basic building footprint, architecture, landscaped areas, and vehicular access as the Modified Project. The development associated with this alternative would include the demolition of the existing Marina Inn and boater service buildings. This alternative would be consistent with land use designation and zoning districts within the project site.

5.6.2 Environmental Analysis

5.6.2.1 Aesthetics

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with a hotel development at a reduced intensity compared to the Modified Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative involves the elimination of the top floor of the proposed Dana House Hotel (a reduction of 26 rooms). Similar to the Modified Project, while implementation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would modify views to and from the project site, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on views of the Pacific Ocean, Dana Point Harbor, Headlands, coastal bluffs, or California coastline from adjacent roadways, sidewalks or other public vantage points. Additionally, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce the scale and overall height of the proposed Dana House Hotel. Therefore, potential impacts of the Reduced Intensity Alternative on scenic vistas, including scenic overlooks as well as the Primary and Supplemental View Corridors identified in the DPHRP would be less than significant, and slightly less than those of the Modified Project.

Similar to the Modified Project, proposed structures under the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be consistent with the California Coastal design theme outlined in the DPHRP&DR intended to unify the DPHRP Planning Areas. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would also be consistent with the allowable uses for the site as provided in the DPHRP&DR. Overall, the building massing on site would be slightly less than the Modified Project because the fourth floor of the proposed Dana House Hotel would be eliminated: therefore, since this alternative would result in a reduced building

size overall, it would result in fewer overall visual changes to the project site than the Modified Project. Because lighting would still be required to illuminate the development proposed under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, this alternative would be subject to Mitigation Measure 4.2-4, as originally included in EIR No. 591, which requires the preparation of an Exterior Lighting Plan. The overall visual impacts of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated, similar to the Modified Project.

5.6.2.2 Air Quality

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with hotel development at a reduced intensity compared to the Modified Project. A similar grading footprint but less construction would be required for the Reduced Intensity Alternative compared to the Modified Project because the fourth floor of the Dana House Hotel would be eliminated; therefore, construction emissions would be less than the Modified Project and remain less than significant. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would generate fewer operational vehicle average daily trips (ADT) and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) than the Modified Project because there would be less square footage associated with the hotel development, resulting in a reduction of hotel patrons and employees required for operation of the hotels. Similarly, due to the reduced square footage, air emissions from stationary sources related to hotel operations (i.e., appliances, landscaping equipment, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), and lighting) would also be reduced. As a result, similar to the Modified Project, emissions generated during operation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds and would be less than significant. As such, air quality impacts of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be less than the Modified Project.

5.6.2.3 Cultural Resources

Similar to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined by CEQA because no previously recorded historical resources were identified on the project site. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with hotel uses at a lower intensity than the Modified Project, but would require similar ground-disturbing construction activities for the development. Similar to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would have a low likelihood of encountering intact buried archaeological deposits and previously discovered buried human remains during ground-disturbing construction activities due to the nature of the on-site soils. Overall, impacts to cultural resources for the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be less than significant and similar to those associated with the Modified Project.

5.6.2.4 Energy

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with hotel uses at a reduced intensity compared to the Modified Project. A similar grading footprint would be required for the Reduced Intensity Alternative compared to the Modified Project, but less construction required as the fourth floor would be eliminated from Dana House Hotel. Therefore, energy use during construction would be incrementally less than the Modified Project. Similar to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources or conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable

energy or energy efficiency; therefore, impacts related to energy use would be less than significant. However, because the Reduced Intensity Alternative includes less development than the Modified Project, consumption of natural gas, electricity, and fuel during operation would be less than the Modified Project. Similar to the Modified Project, energy impacts for the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be less than significant. Overall, energy impacts for this alternative would be less than the Modified Project.

5.6.2.5 Geology and Soils

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with hotel uses at a reduced intensity compared to the Modified Project. However, the same grading footprint for construction would be required compared to the Modified Project, but with slightly less above-grade construction required due to the elimination of the fourth floor of Dana House Hotel. The required grading and construction activities would result in similar impacts related to geology and soils as the Modified Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be required to implement the same mitigation measures as the Modified Project, which requires compliance with the recommendations of the project *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation*, including a Final Design-Level Geotechnical Report, and the most current California Building Code (CBC) requirements, which stipulates appropriate seismic design provisions that shall be implemented with project design and construction. Therefore, like the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils with implementation of mitigation. Given the similar grading and excavation footprint and similar construction activities, the geology-related impacts of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be similar to those of the Modified Project.

5.6.2.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with hotel uses at a reduced intensity compared to the Modified Project. A similar grading footprint but less construction would be required for the Reduced Intensity Alternative compared to the Modified Project; therefore, greenhouse gas emission during construction would be less than the Modified Project. Because the Reduced Intensity Alternative includes less development and would generate fewer vehicle trips overall than the Modified Project, greenhouse gas emissions during operation would also be less than the Modified Project. Similar to the Modified Project, the greenhouse gas emission impacts of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be less than significant. Overall, greenhouse gas emission impacts for this alternative would be less than the Modified Project.

5.6.2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with hotel uses at a reduced intensity compared to the Modified Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would involve demolition of the existing structures and construction of new buildings that would result in similar impacts related to hazardous waste and materials compared to the Modified Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be required to implement the same mitigation measures as the Modified Project, which requires adherence to procedures for handling and disposal of hazardous building materials and procedures for handling suspect or unknown hazardous materials during demolition and construction. Operation activities on the project site would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials typical of hotel uses (e.g., solvents, cleaning agents, paints, pool chemicals,

fertilizers, and pesticides) that, when used correctly and in compliance with existing laws and regulations, would not result in a significant hazard to visitors or workers in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, with mitigation, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in less than significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, hazardous materials impacts for this alternative would be similar to the Modified Project.

5.6.2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with hotel uses at a reduced intensity compared to the Modified Project. Because the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be constructed on the same project site as the Modified Project and with the same footprint, the same soil disturbance would occur during construction. In addition, the impervious surface area on the project site would be similar to the Modified Project. Also similar to the Modified Project, preparation of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) and the implementation of BMPs during the construction and operation phases, as required in compliance of the NPDES Permit and South Orange County MS4 Permit, would ensure that measures to protect water quality are incorporated for this development. Therefore, this alternative would not generate significant water quality impacts. Similar to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would have less than significant impacts on hydrology and water quality. Because the development footprint would remain the same, impacts for this alternative would be similar to those associated with the Modified Project.

5.6.2.9 Land Use and Planning

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with hotel uses at a reduced intensity compared to the Modified Project. With the Coastal Commission's February 5, 2025, certification of LCP-5-DPT-21-0079-2 allowing the proposed increases in the number of hotels and hotel rooms, and the reapportionment of the other land use categories in the Dana Point Harbor Statistical Table for PA 3 in the Dana Point Harbor District Regulations (DPHDR), the reduced intensity alternative would not require a ZTA and Local Coastal Program Amendment (LCPA). Similar to the Modified Project, issuance of a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) would ensure the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be consistent with applicable provisions in the City's Municipal Code related to development within its coastal zone generally and within the Dana Point Harbor specifically. Because of the similar proposed uses, the Reduced Intensity Alternative, like the Modified Project, would be consistent with applicable regionally and locally adopted land use plans, policies, and regulations, including the California Coastal Act (CCA), the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan, Connect SoCal (the SCAG 2024 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy [RTP/SCS]), the City of Dana Point General Plan, the Dana Point Zoning Code, and the DPHRP&DR. Therefore, similar to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to potential conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations. Overall, land use impacts of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be similar to the Modified Project.

5.6.2.10 Noise

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would involve a grading footprint and construction activities similar to the Modified Project; therefore, this alternative would result in similar construction noise

impacts associated with grading and construction activities than the Modified Project. However, the construction period and associated noise may be a shorter duration due to the decreased building area associated with elimination of one floor of Dana House Hotel. Similar to the Modified Project, construction noise impacts would be less than significant, and overall, less than the Modified Project.

Similar to the Modified Project, operational noise would include vehicular noise associated with traffic during operation of the hotel uses, as well as operational noise associated with outdoor speakers used for background music as well as live music and entertainment, and noise associated with individual events at one of the outdoor event areas. However, because fewer hotel rooms would be constructed under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, these vehicle trips and associated vehicular operational noise levels would be incrementally reduced. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would include rooftop air equipment associated with the HVAC system, similar to the Modified Project. However, similar to the Modified Project, HVAC noise levels would be well below the daytime standard and nighttime standards for surrounding uses. However, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would still be subject to Mitigation Measure 4.10-1, which would require the preparation of an acoustical study. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would have less than significant noise impacts with mitigation incorporated, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, this alternative would have slightly less noise impacts as compared to the Modified Project.

5.6.2.11 Public Services

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with hotel uses at a reduced intensity compared to the Modified Project. Compared to the Modified Project, under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, the demand for fire protection and emergency services and police protection services would be reduced incrementally because fewer hotel rooms would be developed on the project site and fewer visitors would be present. Similar to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be required to implement the same mitigation measure requiring the Project Applicant to enter into a Secured Fire Protection Agreement with Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) in order to address any outstanding potential impacts to fire services. Therefore, similar to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would have less than significant impacts on public services. Overall, this alternative would have less impacts as compared to the Modified Project.

5.6.2.12 Transportation

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with hotel uses at a reduced intensity compared to the Modified Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in fewer vehicle trips to and from the project site because of the reduced number of hotel rooms. Like the Modified Project, all study area intersections would continue to operate at satisfactory level of service (LOS) during both peak hours under the Reduced Intensity Alternative. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not result in an inconsistency with applicable plans and policies related to roadway performance. Additionally, due to the reduction in the number of hotel rooms and corresponding reduction in the number of patrons frequenting the site and staff required for hotel operations, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a reduction in the VMT compared to the Modified Project. Because the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in less vehicle trips compared to the Modified Project, traffic impacts would be less than significant, similar

to the Modified Project. Overall, this alternative would have less impacts as compared to the Modified Project.

5.6.2.13 Tribal Cultural Resources

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with hotel uses at a reduced intensity compared to the Modified Project. Similar to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would require a comparable level of ground-disturbing construction activities during the development. Similar to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined by CEQA that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register or a local register because no previously recorded cultural resources were identified in the project site during the records search or during the Native American consultation. Given that the project site was previously covered by waters of the Pacific Ocean prior to construction of the Dana Point Harbor, and subsequently constructed using imported sediments, the likelihood of encountering intact subsurface archaeological cultural resources during ground-disturbing construction activities is low, similar to the Modified Project. Therefore, similar to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in no impacts to tribal cultural resources that are listed or eligible for listing in the California Register or a local register, and less than significant impacts for previously undiscovered significant tribal cultural resources and Native American human remains. Overall, impacts for this alternative would be similar to the Modified Project.

5.6.2.14 Utilities and Service Systems

Compared to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in slightly less demand for electricity, natural gas, water, and telecommunications because of the reduced number of hotel rooms on the project site. As mentioned in subsection 5.6.2.8 above, the impervious surface area on the project site would decrease similar to the Modified Project and as such would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities which would ultimately cause significant impacts. Additionally, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would generate less solid waste and wastewater. Similar to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would have less than significant impacts on utilities. Overall, this alternative would have less impacts related to utilities and service systems as compared to the Modified Project.

5.6.3 Overview of Potential Impact/Comparison to Modified Project

Similar to the Modified Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts. Due to the elimination of the 26 hotel rooms under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, overall impacts would be reduced compared to impacts associated with the Modified Project. Specifically, impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, public services, transportation, and utilities and service systems would be reduced as compared to the Modified Project.

5.6.4 Attainment of Project Objectives

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the project site with a hotel development similar to that of the Modified Project, but at a reduced intensity. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would

develop two hotels with a market-rate hotel and a hotel with affordable overnight accommodations that would be accessible to visitors characterized by a range of income levels, would develop a project that balances the development potential of the project site with environmental considerations, and would revitalize the site with a well-designed and landscaped hotel project that is compatible with the surrounding community and helps implement the planned revitalization of the Dana Point Harbor. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would also develop a project that would promote sustainability and provide enhanced facilities for boaters and maintain boater designated parking in close proximity to the boat slips they serve. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would also increase the City's tax base and invigorate the local economy, although these goals would be met to a lesser extent compared to the Modified Project due to the reduced number of hotel rooms, provided it is financially viable. Therefore, provided that it is financially viable, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be consistent with all of the project objectives, but to a lesser degree than the Modified Project.

5.7 ALTERNATIVE 3: MIXED USE ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would include the demolition of the Marina Inn and boater services buildings, and the development of hotel and retail/restaurant uses on the project site. The Mixed Use Alternative involves the replacement of Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space and the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project. The total building square footage would be approximately 166,293 sf less than the Modified Project under the Mixed Use Alternative. Boater service facilities would be provided at Surf Lodge or incorporated in the proposed retail/restaurant structure, and designated boater parking would continue to be provided on site. The Mixed Use Intensity Alternative would have the same basic building footprint, architecture, landscaped areas, and vehicular access, and include the same podium design as the Modified Project. This alternative would also be consistent with the existing land use designation and zoning districts on the project site.

5.7.1 Environmental Analysis

5.7.1.1 Aesthetics

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces the proposed Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. A similar grading footprint would be required for this alternative as for the Modified Project. Similar to the Modified Project, while implementation of the Mixed Use Alternative would modify views to and from the project site, the Mixed Use Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts related to views of the Pacific Ocean, Dana Point Harbor, Headlands, coastal bluffs, or California coastline from adjacent roadways, sidewalks or other public vantage points. Additionally, the Mixed Use Alternative would result in a reduced scale compared to the Modified Project because Dana House Hotel would be replaced with a smaller, presumably reduced height retail and restaurant structure. Therefore, potential impacts of the Mixed Use Alternative on scenic vistas, including scenic overlooks as well as the Primary and Supplemental View Corridors identified in the DPHRP, would be less than significant, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, visual resource impacts for this alternative would be slightly less than those of the Modified Project.

Similar to the Modified Project, proposed structures under the Mixed Use Alternative would be consistent with the California Coastal design theme outlined in the DPHRP&DR intended to unify the Dana Point Harbor Revitalization PAs. The Mixed Use Alternative would also be consistent with the allowable uses for the site as provided in the DPHRP&DR. Overall, the building massing on site would be less than the Modified Project because Dana House Hotel would be replaced with a smaller structure: since this alternative would result in a smaller project overall with a smaller structure replacing Dana House Hotel in the Modified Project, the Mixed Use Alternative would therefore result in fewer overall visual changes to the project site than the Modified Project. Because lighting would still be required to illuminate the development proposed under the Mixed Use Alternative, this alternative would be subject to Mitigation Measure 4.2-4, as originally included in EIR No. 591, which requires the preparation of an Exterior Lighting Plan. The overall visual impacts of the Mixed Use would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated, similar to the Modified Project.

5.7.1.2 Air Quality

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces the Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. A similar grading footprint would be required for this alternative, as for the Modified Project. However, the Mixed Use Alternative would require less building construction activities because the total building square footage would be less than that of the Modified Project. The Mixed Use Alternative would generate fewer stationary air source emissions compared to the Modified Project, due to the reduced energy use required for operation (i.e., appliances, landscaping equipment, HVAC, and lighting) that would be required for the retail and restaurant uses under this alternative. The Mixed Use Alternative would also result in fewer overall ADT due to the reduction in square footage, patrons, and number of employees anticipated for operation. While retail and restaurant uses may require more truck deliveries compared to hotel uses, the Mixed Use Alternative would result in an overall reduction of 166,293 sf of development. Therefore, the Mixed Use Alternative would generate reduced mobile source vehicle emissions and reduced total emissions compared to the Modified Project. Similar to the Modified Project, construction and operational emissions of the Mixed Use Alternative would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds. As such, air quality impacts of the Mixed Use Alternative would be less than significant, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, air quality impacts for this alternative would be less than the Modified Project.

5.7.1.3 Cultural Resources

Similar to the Modified Project, the Mixed Use Alternative would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined by CEQA because no previously recorded historical resources were identified on the project site. The Mixed Use Alternative would require a similar grading footprint as the Modified Project, and would require similar ground-disturbing construction activities for the development. Similar to the Modified Project, the Mixed Use Alternative would have a low likelihood of encountering intact buried archaeological deposits and previously discovered buried human remains during ground-disturbing construction activities. Therefore, impacts to cultural resources for the Mixed Use Alternative would be less than significant, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, cultural resource impacts for this alternative would be similar to the Modified Project.

5.7.1.4 Energy

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. This alternative would require a similar grading footprint but less construction overall; therefore, energy use during construction would be less than the Modified Project. The Mixed Use Alternative would result in reduced operational energy usage related to consumption of natural gas, electricity, and fuel during operation compared to the Modified Project, due to the lower energy demand required for 25,000 sf of retail or restaurant building infrastructure, appliances, landscaping equipment, consumer products, and solid waste generation as compared to the Dana House Hotel under the Modified Project. Additionally, the Mixed Use Alternative would generate fewer average daily vehicle trips than the Modified Project, due to the reduction in square footage, patrons and number of employees anticipated for operation. While more truck delivery trips may be anticipated for retail and restaurant uses, the overall ADT and VMT would be less than the Modified Project. Therefore, less fuel would be consumed under this alternative than the Modified Project from vehicle trips during operation. Similar to the Modified Project, the Mixed Use Alternative would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources or conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency; therefore, impacts related to energy use would be less than significant, similar to the Modified Project.

5.7.1.5 Geology and Soils

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. This alternative would require a similar grading footprint as the Modified Project. The required grading and construction activities would result in similar impacts related to geology and soils as the Modified Project. The Mixed Use Alternative would be required to implement the same mitigation measures as the Modified Project, which requires compliance with the recommendations of the project *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation*, including a Final Design-Level Geotechnical Report, and the most current CBC requirements, and which stipulates appropriate seismic design provisions that shall be implemented with project design and construction. Therefore, like the Modified Project, the Mixed Use Alternative would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils with implementation of mitigation. For the reasons stated above, the geology-related impacts of the Mixed Use Alternative would be similar to those of the Modified Project.

5.7.1.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. A similar grading footprint but less construction would be required for the Mixed Use Alternative compared to the Modified Project because the total building square footage would be approximately 166,293 sf less than the Modified Project; therefore, greenhouse gas emissions during construction would be less than the Modified Project. Additionally, average daily vehicle trips under the Mixed Use Alternative would be fewer than the Modified Project due to the reduction in square footage, patrons, and number of employees anticipated for operation. Due to the retail and restaurant uses, this alternative may also require more truck deliveries compared to the Modified Project. However, the overall reduction in ADT and VMT from the reduced patrons and employees

would result in an overall reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. This alternative would still provide pedestrian and bicycle access, and bicycle parking opportunities promoting connectivity to other retail, restaurant, and recreational opportunities due to its location within the Harbor. Similar to the Modified Project, the greenhouse gas emissions impacts of the Mixed Use Alternative would be less than significant. Because the Mixed Use Alternative includes less development and would generate fewer employee vehicle trips overall than the Modified Project, its greenhouse gas emissions during operation would be slightly less than the Modified Project.

5.7.1.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. The Mixed Use Alternative would involve demolition of the existing structures and construction of new buildings that would result in similar impacts related to hazardous waste and materials when compared to the Modified Project. The Mixed Use Alternative would be required to implement the same mitigation measures as the Modified Project, which requires adherence to procedures for handling and disposal of hazardous building materials and procedures for handling suspect or unknown hazardous materials during demolition and construction. Operational activities on the project site would involve the use of small quantities of hazardous materials or wastes similar to the Modified Project. Potentially hazardous materials typical of hotel, retail, and restaurant uses, when used correctly and in compliance with existing laws and regulations, would not result in a significant hazard to visitors or workers in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the Mixed Use Alternative would result in less than significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, hazardous materials impacts for this alternative would be similar to the Modified Project.

5.7.1.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. Because the Mixed Use Alternative would be constructed on the same project site and with a similar construction footprint as the Modified Project, the same soil disturbance would occur during construction. In addition, the impervious surface area on the project site would be similar to the Modified Project. Also similar to the Modified Project, preparation of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) and the implementation of BMPs during the construction and operation phases, as required in compliance with the NPDES Permit and South Orange County MS4 Permit, would ensure that this alternative would not generate significant water quality impacts. The Mixed Use Alternative would have less than significant impacts on hydrology and water quality, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts for this alternative would be similar to the Modified Project.

5.7.1.9 Land Use and Planning

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. Like the Modified Project, although the proposed uses are consistent with the DPHDR, the development intensity differs from that contained in the Dana Point Harbor Statistical Table for PA 3

in Chapter 17 of the DPHDR. The proposed reapportionment of the other land use categories in the Dana Point Harbor Statistical Table for PA 3, as well as text changes in the DPHRP&DR to address the reapportioned land use categories require a ZTA and an LCPA. Similar to the Modified Project, issuance of a CDP would ensure the Mixed Use Alternative would be consistent with applicable provisions in the City's Municipal Code related to development within its coastal zone. The Mixed Use Alternative would be consistent with applicable regionally and locally adopted land use plans, policies, and regulations, including the California Coastal Act (CCA), the SCAG 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan, Connect SoCal (the SCAG 2024 RTP/SCS), the City of Dana Point General Plan, the Dana Point Zoning Code, and the DPHRP&DR. Therefore, the Mixed Use Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to potential conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, land use impacts for this alternative would be similar to the Modified Project.

5.7.1.10 Noise

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. The Mixed Use Alternative would involve a grading area similar to the Modified Project. However, the Mixed Use Alternative would require less building construction activities because the total building square footage would be approximately 166,923 sf less than the Modified Project. Therefore, the level of noise generated during construction would be less than the Modified Project and would occur for a shorter period of time. Construction noise impacts would be less than significant, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, construction noise would be less than the Modified Project.

Operational noise would include vehicular noise associated with traffic related to the occupancy and operation of the hotel, retail, and restaurant uses. The Mixed Use Alternative would have fewer average daily vehicle trips than the Modified Project, due to the reduction in square footage, patrons, and number of employees anticipated for operation. While this alternative may require more truck deliveries due to the retail and restaurant uses, the overall trips and corresponding vehicular noise from this 25,000 sf development would be reduced compared to the Modified Project. The Mixed Use Alternative would also include rooftop air equipment associated with the HVAC system. However, similar to the Modified Project, HVAC noise levels would be well below the daytime standard and nighttime standards for surrounding uses. Furthermore, the Mixed Use Alternative would not include the development of outdoor event areas, amplified speaker systems, or live music that would occur on the rooftop terrace of Dana House Hotel and result in operational noise as part of the Modified Project. However, the proposed restaurant uses under this alternative would still be anticipated to include some outdoor event areas that would result in operational noise. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would still be subject to Mitigation Measure 4.10-1, which would require the preparation of an acoustical study. Therefore, the Mixed Use Alternative would have less than significant noise impacts with mitigation incorporated, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, this alternative would have similar operational noise impacts as the Modified Project.

5.7.1.11 Public Services

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces the Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. Compared to the Modified Project, under the Mixed Use Alternative, the demand for fire protection and emergency services and police protection services would be reduced because fewer hotel rooms and less total building square footage would be developed on the project site. Similar to the Modified Project, the Mixed Use Alternative would be required to implement the same mitigation measure requiring the Project Applicant to enter into a Secured Fire Protection Agreement with OCFA in order to address any outstanding potential impacts to fire services. Therefore, the Mixed Use Alternative would have less than significant impacts on public services, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, this alternative would have less public service impacts than the Modified Project due to the reduction of square footage and elimination of 130 hotel rooms.

5.7.1.12 Transportation

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces the Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. While retail and restaurant uses may require more truck deliveries compared to the Modified Project and may result in slightly higher traffic volumes during the weekday PM and weekend peak hours, this alternative would result in a reduced overall ADT and VMT, due to the reduction in patrons and reduction in employees anticipated for operation. In addition, similar to the Modified Project, all study area intersections would continue to operate at satisfactory LOS during both peak hours mentioned above under the Mixed Use Alternative. Therefore, the Mixed Use Alternative would not result in an inconsistency with applicable plans and policies related to roadway performance. Impacts would be less than significant for this alternative, similar to the Modified Project. This alternative would still provide pedestrian and bicycle access, bicycle parking opportunities promoting connectivity to other retail, restaurant, and recreational opportunities due to its location within the Harbor. While the Mixed Use Alternative may result in a greater number of vehicle trips during the weekday PM and weekend peak hours, it would result in fewer ADT and VMT overall compared to the Modified Project; therefore, environmental impacts related to traffic would be less than the Modified Project.

5.7.1.13 Tribal Cultural Resources

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces the Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. The Mixed Use Alternative would require similar ground-disturbing construction activities as the Modified Project during its development. Similar to the Modified Project, the Mixed Use Alternative would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined by CEQA that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register or a local register because no previously recorded cultural resources were identified on the project site during the records search or during the Native American consultation. Given that the project site was previously covered by waters of the Pacific Ocean prior to construction of the Dana Point Harbor, and subsequently constructed using imported sediments, the likelihood of encountering intact subsurface archaeological cultural resources during ground-disturbing construction activities is low for both this alternative and the Modified Project. Therefore, the Mixed Use Alternative would

result in no impacts to tribal cultural resources that are listed or eligible for listing in the California Register or a local register, and less than significant impacts for previously undiscovered significant tribal cultural resources and Native American human remains, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, impacts would be similar to the Modified Project.

5.7.1.14 Utilities and Service Systems

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. Compared to the Modified Project, the Mixed Use Alternative would result in less demand for electricity, natural gas, water, and telecommunications because this alternative would include a reduced number of hotel rooms, which typically have a higher utility demand than retail/commercial uses as retail/commercial uses have limited hours of operation and fewer utilities and appliances per patron. As mentioned in subsection 5.6.3.8 above, the impervious surface area on the project site would decrease similar to the Modified Project and as such would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities which would ultimately cause significant impacts. Additionally, the Mixed Use Alternative would generate less solid waste and wastewater. The Mixed Use Alternative would have less than significant impacts on utilities, similar to the Modified Project. Overall, due to a reduction of approximately 123,500 sf, this alternative would have less impacts related to utilities and service systems than the Modified Project.

5.7.2 Overview of Potential Impact/Comparison to Modified Project

Similar to the Modified Project, the Mixed Use Alternative would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts. However, due to the replacement of Dana House Hotel with a smaller retail and restaurant space, overall impacts would be reduced compared to impacts associated with the Modified Project. Specifically, under the Mixed Use Alternative, traffic impacts would be reduced due to an overall decrease in average daily trips as compared to the Modified Project, due to the reduction in employees anticipated for operation of this smaller development. Similarly, this reduction in employees would also result in a reduction of VMT and consequently, a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. However, the Mixed Use Alternative may result in more truck deliveries compared to the Modified Project and slightly higher traffic volumes during the weekday PM and weekend peak hours due to the change in uses. This alternative would still provide pedestrian and bicycle access, and bicycle parking opportunities promoting connectivity to other retail, restaurant, and recreational opportunities due to its location within the Harbor. Due to the reduction in patrons and reduction in employees for operation, the overall average daily trips, VMT, air quality, greenhouse gases, and energy impacts would be reduced. In addition, public service and utility impacts would also be reduced under this alternative compared to the Modified Project because this alternative would include retail/commercial uses, which would typically have a lower utility and public service demand than hotel rooms, due to limited hours of operation.

5.7.3 Attainment of Project Objectives

The Mixed Use Alternative involves the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and replaces Dana House Hotel with approximately 25,000 sf of retail and restaurant space. The Mixed Use Alternative would not meet the goal of developing two hotels offering a mix of

market-rate and affordable overnight accommodations that would be accessible to visitors characterized by a range of income levels. In addition, the Mixed Use Alternative would not meet the goal of developing a project that balances the development potential of the project site with environmental considerations, as the full potential of overnight accommodations would not be developed as currently permitted with the approved ZTA/LCPA that proposes a change in the intensity of uses provided in Table 17A of the Dana Point Harbor District Regulations (DPHDR) for PA 3. With the February 5, 2025, certification by the California Coastal Commission of the ZTA/LCPA with suggested modifications, the DPHRP&DR, as amended, allows for the development of both affordable and market-rate overnight accommodations as accounted for under the Modified Project. This alternative would revitalize the site with a well-designed and landscaped hotel and retail/commercial project that is compatible with the surrounding community and planned revitalization of the Dana Point Harbor, but to a lesser extent than the Modified Project. The Mixed Use Alternative would also develop a project that would promote sustainability and provide enhanced facilities for boaters and maintain designated boater parking in close proximity to the boat slips they serve. The Mixed Use Alternative would increase the City's tax base and invigorate the local economy, but not to the same degree as the Modified Project. Therefore, the Mixed Use Alternative would meet some of the project objectives, but to a lesser extent than the Modified Project.

5.8 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/No Development 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 Modified Project.

The No Project/No Development Alternative has the least impact to the environment because it would not result in any construction activities on the project site or the intensification of land uses. While the No Project Alternative would avoid any potential impacts of the Modified Project, the beneficial impacts of the Modified Project including the revitalization of the project site and invigoration of the local economy would not occur, and none of the project objectives would be met.

With the exception of the No Project Alternative, the environmentally superior alternative would be Alternative 2, the Reduced Intensity Alternative. This alternative would result in either reduced or similar environmental impacts compared to the Modified Project. Although the Reduced Intensity Alternative would achieve all of the project objectives, it would not achieve these objectives to the same degree as the Modified Project and would not maximize the potential of the project site. Similar to the Reduced Intensity Alternative, the Mixed Use Alternative would also result in either reduced or similar environmental impacts compared to the Modified Project.

However, the Mixed Use Alternative would not meet all of the project objectives, and not to the same degree as the Modified Project. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative was identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Table 5.B: Comparison of the Environmental Impacts of the Modified Project to the Project Alternatives

Environmental Topic	Modified Project Level of Impacts After Mitigation	Alt 1: No Project Alternative	Alt 2: Reduced Intensity Alternative	Alt 3: Mixed Use Alternative
Aesthetics	Less Than Significant	L	L	L
Air Quality	Less Than Significant	L	L	L
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Less Than Significant	L	S	S
Energy	Less Than Significant	L	L	L
Geology and Soils	Less Than Significant	L	S	S
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Less Than Significant	L	L	L
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less Than Significant	L	S	S
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less Than Significant	L	S	S
Land Use and Planning	Less Than Significant	S	S	S
Noise – Construction/Operation	Less Than Significant	L/L	L/L	L/S
Public Services and Utilities	Less Than Significant	L	L	L
Transportation/Traffic	Less Than Significant	L	L	L
Attainment of Modified Project Objectives	Meets all of the project objectives	Meets none of the project objectives	Meets all of the project objectives, but not to the same degree as the Modified Project	Meets some of the project objectives, but not to the same degree as the Modified Project

Source: LSA (December 2024).

Alt = Alternative

L = Less impact than the Modified Project; reduces or eliminates significant and adverse impacts

S = Similar impacts as the Modified Project; does not eliminate significant and adverse impacts