

6.0 Alternatives

Rationale For Alternatives Selection

CEQA requires the consideration of alternative development scenarios and the analysis of impacts associated with the alternatives. Through comparison of these alternatives to the proposed project, the advantages of each can be weighed and analyzed. Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR, "describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives."

Additionally, Section 15126.6 of the Guidelines states:

- The specific alternative of "no project" shall also be evaluated along with its impact . . . 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)(1)(2))
- . . . An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. . . . The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly discuss the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. . . . Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii), infeasibility¹, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. (15126.6(a)(c))

¹ Section 15364 of the CEQA Guidelines defines feasible as follows: "'Feasible' means capable of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors."

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

1. A description of alternatives considered;
2. An analysis of whether each alternative meets most of the basic objectives of the proposed project as described in Section 3.0 of this EIR; and
3. A comparative analysis of the alternatives under consideration and the proposed project. The focus of this analysis is to determine if alternatives are capable of eliminating or reducing the significant environmental effects of the project to a less than significant level. **Table 6-1** provides a summary of this analysis.

**Table 6-1
Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project**

| Impact | No Project/ Existing General Plan | Limited Access Conventional Highway | Agricultural Preservation Program | Clustered Development |
|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| Aesthetics | Similar | Similar | Less | Less |
| Agricultural Resources | Similar | Similar | Less | Less |
| Air Quality | Similar | Greater | Less | Less |
| Biological Resources | Similar | Similar | Less | Less |
| Cultural Resources | Similar | Similar | Less | Less |
| Geology/Soils and Mineral Resources | Similar | Similar | Less | Similar |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials | Similar | Less | Less | Less |
| Hydrology/Water Quality | Similar | Similar | Similar | Similar |
| Land Use | Similar | Less | Similar | Similar |
| Noise | Similar | Greater | Less | Greater |
| Population and Housing | Greater | Similar | Less | Similar |
| Public Services and Recreation | Similar | Similar | Less | Similar |
| Transportation | Similar | Greater | Less | Less |
| Utilities and Services System | Similar | Similar | Less | Similar |
| Conclusion | Environmentally Inferior | Environmentally Inferior | Environmentally Superior | Environmentally Superior |

Source: P&D Consultants, 2006.

Alternatives Rejected from Consideration

Alternative Location

The CEQA Guidelines recommend considering an alternative location to reduce potential impacts of a proposed project. The proposed General Plan is a plan guiding the growth and development of areas that are located within the jurisdiction of San Jacinto. Because no other lands are within the jurisdiction of the City, no alternative location is analyzed.

6.1 No Project/Existing General Plan

This alternative is analyzed within this EIR as it is a required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e). According to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the “no project” analysis shall discuss, “. . . what is reasonably 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.” This alternative assumes that the proposed General Plan would not be adopted and implemented. Instead, the San Jacinto Planning Area would be developed according to the land use and circulation plans as well as the other policies and programs of the existing (1988) General Plan.

Description of Alternative

The No Project/Existing General Plan alternative considers the environmental impact associated with development per the City’s existing General Plan land use map. This alternative would leave the existing General Plan in place as the City’s primary policy document and would not include the updated planning tools or Implementation Programs that address the current Planning Area and regional setting that have been developed as a part of the proposed General Plan. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would use the same land use designations, general plan policies, and existing laws and zoning to address future development in San Jacinto.

Comparison of Environmental Impacts to Proposed Project

Aesthetics

The Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of urban development in the Planning Area and accompanying impacts associated with aesthetic resources. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would create similar impacts to scenic vistas and the visual character and quality of the City of San Jacinto. Development allowed pursuant to the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would have to comply with the City’s Lighting Regulations that are contained within the Zoning Ordinance to reduce light and glare impacts to less than significant. Furthermore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not have any impacts associated with a State Scenic Highway. The existing General Plan would not include the mitigation measures described in Section 5.1 of this document and therefore would not mitigate impacts to aesthetic resources to same

level as the proposed General Plan. However, it is expected that even if the proposed General Plan and associated Implementation Programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and programs in order to reduce aesthetics impacts in the Planning Area to a level less than significant. Overall, impacts to aesthetic resources would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Agricultural Resources

The Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of development of agricultural resources in the Planning Area, including the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. Implementation of this alternative would also likely include the conversion of land zoned for agricultural uses and land protected under Williamson Act contracts to other land uses. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not alter any existing water resources or other natural resources that would make farming activities within the Planning Area infeasible. Although the Existing General Plan had a larger amount of agricultural parcels than the proposed General Plan, Land Use Policy 18 in the existing General Plan allowed for the development of these agricultural resources by stating: "Existing agricultural uses shall be permitted to remain in agricultural use at the owner's discretion. Transition of agricultural to more urbanized uses is expected and consistent with City objectives for the future." Therefore, because the same Planning Area is expected to be developed with urban uses, a similar amount of agricultural land would be developed under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative.

It is also expected that even if the proposed General Plan and associated Implementation Programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and programs in order to reduce agricultural impacts in the Planning Area to the extent feasible. However, like the proposed General Plan, implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would have significant and unmitigable impacts on agricultural resources. Overall, impacts to agricultural resources would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative and proposed General Plan.

Air Quality

The Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of urban development in the Planning Area and accompanying, construction, vehicular, and stationary air quality impacts. Consequently, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would similarly violate the air quality standards, the SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan, and create objectionable odors discussed in Section 5.3 of this document, but would not create significant impacts related to pollutant concentrations. It is also expected that even if the proposed Plan update and associated implementation programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and programs in order to reduce air quality impacts in the Planning Area to the extent feasible. However, like the proposed General Plan, implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would have significant and unmitigable impacts on air quality. Overall, impacts to air quality would be similar under either the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative or the proposed General Plan.

Biological Resources

The implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of urban development and overall land disturbance in the Planning Area. Therefore, a similar amount of biological resources would be disturbed and developed for urban uses. It is expected that even if the proposed General Plan and associated Implementation Programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and programs in order to reduce biological resources impacts in the Planning Area to a level less than significant. This assumption is particularly true since future development in the Planning Area would be required to be consistent with the mitigation efforts established by the Western Riverside Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and would be subject to future environmental analysis and mitigation per CEQA to mitigate impacts related to sensitive or special status species, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, federally protected wetlands, or wildlife corridors to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Furthermore, implementation of this alternative would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or conflict with the provisions of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Overall, impacts to biological resources would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan.

Cultural Resources

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of urban development and overall land disturbance in the Planning Area. Therefore, a similar amount of historic resources would potentially be impacted by implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan alternative. Additionally, a similar number of archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would be impacted. It is expected that even if the proposed General Plan and associated Implementation Programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and programs in order to reduce cultural resources impacts in the Planning Area to a level less than significant. This assumption is particularly true since future development in the Planning Area would be required to be consistent with existing applicable laws and regulations and would be subject to future environmental analysis and mitigation per CEQA and to mitigate impacts to historical resources, archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to cultural resources would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan.

Geology/Soils and Mineral Resources

This alternative would result in a similar level of urban development and land disturbance in the Planning Area and accompanying impacts associated with geology/soils. It is expected that even if the proposed General Plan and associated Implementation Programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and programs in order to reduce geology/soils impacts in the Planning Area to a level less than significant. This assumption is particularly true since future development in the Planning Area would be required to be consistent with existing applicable laws and regulations and would be subject to future environmental analysis and mitigation per CEQA to mitigate impacts related to geologic, seismic, and soils hazards to a level similar to the proposed General Plan.

This alternative would not propose additional development outside of the Planning Area not described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan. Therefore, this alternative would only develop land classified as MRZ-1 as described in Section 5.6 and would not have any significant impacts on mineral resources. Overall, impacts to geology/soils and mineral resources would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of development in the Planning Area and accompanying impacts with respect to hazardous materials, fires, or flooding. It is expected that even if the proposed General Plan and associated Implementation Programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and programs in order to reduce hazards and hazardous materials impacts in the Planning Area to a level less than significant. This assumption is particularly true since future development in the Planning Area would be required to be consistent with existing applicable laws and regulations and would be subject to future environmental analysis and mitigation per CEQA to mitigate impact related to hazardous materials, fires, or flooding to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Additionally, compliance with existing applicable laws and regulations would ensure that the No Project/Existing General Plan would not impede the City's ability to respond to emergencies. Overall, impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Implementation of this alternative would result in similar impacts to hydrology/water quality as the proposed General Plan. A similar amount of impervious surfaces would be created in the Planning Area which would potentially contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, substantially alter the existing drainage patterns in the City or degrade or deplete groundwater or surface water resources. A similar amount of pollutants and run-off would be generated under this alternative as well that could impact water quality or water discharge requirements. It is expected that even if the proposed General Plan and associated Implementation Programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and programs in order to reduce hydrology/water quality impacts in the Planning Area to a level less than significant. This assumption is particularly true given the number and breadth of existing local, State, and federal requirements addressing hydrology/water quality. Furthermore, future development in the Planning Area would be required to be consistent with existing applicable laws and regulations and would be subject to future environmental analysis and mitigation per CEQA to mitigate impacts related to hydrology/water quality to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to hydrology/water quality would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan.

Land Use

The Existing General Plan stated that the City of San Jacinto had a total planning area of 16,165 acres. Within this total area, 63.3 percent was designated for residential uses, 6.2

percent for commercial uses, 2.9 percent for light industrial, 2.1 percent for public/institutional, and 25.5 percent for open space. However, the land use designations for the Existing General Plan cannot be compared to the land use assumptions for the proposed General Plan since the previous projection was based on a different buildout period and different land area. Furthermore, current conditions have resulted in new growth demands, housing trends, and other needs that would require a set of guidelines to govern growth in San Jacinto. The proposed General Plan incorporates additional land use categories to meet these demands.

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of development in the Planning Area as the proposed General Plan. However, the Existing General Plan does not provide the same mixture of residential and non-residential land use designations to meet the variety of housing, employment and recreational needs in the community. In particular, the Existing General Plan does not have a Very High Density residential category that would allow for the development of multi-family residential units at up to 22 dwelling units per acre. However, because the Existing General Plan is more or less consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and Map, required revisions to the existing Zoning Map may be less under this alternative.

It is expected that even if the proposed General Plan and associated Implementation Programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and Programs in order to reduce land use impacts in the Planning Area to a level less than significant. Similar to the proposed project, the No Project/Existing General Plan would not divide an established community nor would it conflict with the provisions of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Furthermore, future development in the Planning Area would be required to be consistent with existing applicable laws and regulations and would be subject to future environmental analysis and mitigation per CEQA to mitigate impacts related to conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, land use impacts would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan.

Noise

The Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of development in the Planning Area and accompanying impacts associated with noise. It is expected that even if the proposed Plan update and associated Implementation Programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and Programs in order to reduce noise impacts in the Planning Area to a level less than significant. This assumption is particularly true since future development in the Planning Area would be required to be consistent with existing applicable laws and regulations and would be subject to future environmental analysis and mitigation per CEQA to mitigate noise related impacts to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. This would include impacts related to exceedances of the City of San Jacinto Noise Standards, exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, creation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, or creation of substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Overall, noise related impacts would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan.

Population and Housing

The Existing General Plan estimated that the population of San Jacinto would grow from 9,900 in 1984 to 24,000 by the year 2005. However, the population projections for the year 2005 from the existing General Plan cannot be compared to the current and future population figures for the proposed General Plan since the previous projections were based on a different time period and land area. Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of development in the Planning Area and accompanying levels of housing and population as the proposed General Plan due to a combination of development pressures and economic realities within the region that would continue to foster urban development in communities like San Jacinto.

However, the Existing General Plan would not provide for the variety of residential opportunities as the proposed General Plan. In particular, the Existing General Plan does not have a Very High Density residential category that would allow for the development of multi-family residential units at up to 22 dwelling units per acre. Without this density category, there is the potential that housing affordable to very low income households as defined by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) would not be available in the community. Additionally, there is the potential that without this category, HCD would not certify the City's Housing Element for this housing element cycle. Without HCD certification, fewer State funds would be available to the City for housing programs. This is a significant impact that would likely not occur under the proposed General Plan.

Similar to the proposed project, implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan would not displace a substantial number of existing housing units or people. Overall, population and housing impacts would be greater under the No Project/Existing General Plan due to the absence of the Very High Density residential category in the Existing General Plan.

Public Services and Recreation

This alternative would place similar demands on the public services providers, including police protection, fire protection, schools, libraries, and recreation and open space. It is expected that even if the proposed General Plan and associated Implementation Programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and Programs in order to reduce public services and recreation impacts in the Planning Area to a level less than significant. Furthermore, future development in the Planning Area would be required to be consistent with existing applicable laws and regulations and would be subject to future environmental analysis and mitigation per CEQA to mitigate impacts related to public services and recreation to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to public services and recreation would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan.

Transportation

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar amount of non-residential and residential development in the Planning Area, thus generating a similar number of trips in the Planning Area. It is expected that even if the proposed Plan update and associated

Implementation Programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and Programs. Furthermore, future development in the Planning Area would be required to be consistent with existing applicable laws and regulations and would be subject to future environmental analysis and mitigation per CEQA which would mitigate impacts related to future intersection service levels, roadway design and emergency access, and alternative transportation to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. However, this alternative would still likely have impacts to the two regional roadway segments that would be significant and unavoidable as identified in Section 5.13 of this EIR. Overall, impacts to traffic would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan and would potentially remain significant and unavoidable along Ramona Expressway and State Route 79.

Utilities and Service System

This alternative would place similar demand on the utilities and service providers, including water supply, sewer services, solid waste services, power services, and communication services. It is expected that even if the proposed General Plan and associated Implementation Programs were not adopted, the City would impose requirements similar to those proposed by the General Plan policies and programs in order to reduce utilities and service system impacts in the Planning Area to a level less than significant. Furthermore, future development in the Planning Area would be required to be consistent with existing applicable laws and regulations and would be subject to future environmental analysis and mitigation per CEQA to reduce impacts related to the utilities and service system to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to utilities and services system would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan.

Conclusion

The No Project/Existing General Plan alternative would allow a similar level of residential and non-residential development to occur in the Planning Area. The No Project/Existing General Plan alternative would meet the project objectives of preserving the natural assets and historic resources of our valley, encouraging high quality growth and economic development, ensuring managed growth and the provision of adequate services and facilities at the time development occurs, maintaining the safety and security of our neighborhoods, promoting the development of quality educational facilities through increased cooperation between the City and school districts, and providing for recreation and healthy lifestyles to a degree that would be acceptable. However, the No Project/Existing General Plan alternative would not provide updated planning tools or Implementation Programs that address the current Planning Area and regional setting, which is the general purpose of the proposed General Plan. Furthermore, the No Project/Existing General Plan alternative would provide the same amount of high density housing for low income households consistent with the requirements of the Department of Housing and Community Development or the Regional Housing Needs Assessment provided by the proposed General Plan. Therefore, while impacts would be similar under this alternative, the No Project/Existing General Plan would not meet the project objectives as adequately as the proposed General Plan. This alternative would result in similar environmental impacts to the proposed project, with the exception of impacts to population and housing, which would be greater. Based on this balance of factors and the severity of the impacts, overall this alternative would be environmentally inferior to the proposed project.

6.2 Alternative State Route 79 – Limited Access Conventional Highway

Description of Alternative

This Alternative proposes designating SR-79 as a Limited Access Conventional Highway as opposed to the Freeway designation identified in the proposed General Plan. Based on a previous analysis prepared for this alternative during the planning process, it is estimated that the Limited Access Conventional Highway would carry approximately 30,000 to 50,000 fewer vehicles per day (VPD) through San Jacinto, require less right-of-way, and provide more at-grade crossing points with San Jacinto's local arterials. This General Plan alternative would contain all applicable Policies and Implementation Programs as the proposed General Plan, although certain land uses may be adjusted around the new SR-79 alignment and interchanges. This designation for SR-79 was an alternative considered early in the planning process and is analyzed within this EIR as a means of reducing environmental impacts to create an environmentally superior alternative to the proposed General Plan.

Comparison of Environmental Impacts to Proposed Project

Aesthetics

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of urban development in the Planning Area and accompanying impacts associated with aesthetic resources. The Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would create similar impacts to scenic vistas and the visual character and quality of the City of San Jacinto. Development allowed pursuant the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would have to comply with the City's Lighting Regulations that are contained within the Zoning Ordinance to reduce light and glare impacts to less than significant and would not have any impacts associated with a State Scenic Highway. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.1, would mitigate impacts related to scenic vistas and the visual character or quality of San Jacinto to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to aesthetic resources would be similar under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Agricultural Resources

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of development in the Planning Area, including the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. Implementation of this alternative would also likely include the conversion of land zoned for agricultural uses and land protected under Williamson Act contracts to other land uses. The Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would not alter any existing water resources or other natural resources that would make farming activities within the Planning Area infeasible. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.2 would mitigate impacts related to agricultural resources to the extent feasible. However, similar to the proposed General Plan, implementation of the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would have

significant and unmitigable impacts on agricultural resources. Overall, impacts to agricultural resources would be similar under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Air Quality

The potential for localized vehicular air quality impacts may be greater for this alternative. Although the Limited Access Conventional Highway would generate approximately 30,000 to 50,000 fewer VPD through San Jacinto than is projected to occur with a freeway, the reduced capacity of the Limited Access Conventional Highway could increase traffic congestion and increase air quality impacts related to vehicular emissions. Because a similar amount of development would be allowed under this alternative, a similar level of construction related emissions and stationary source emissions would be generated in the Planning Area and likely in the region. Therefore, project level and cumulative impacts related to air quality standards and SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan discussed in Section 5.3 of this document would likely remain significant and unavoidable. Similar to the proposed project, the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would create objectionable odors but would not create pollutant concentrations. Air quality impacts would be greater with respect to localized vehicular air quality impacts under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative than the proposed General Plan; regional impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Overall, emissions in the Planning Area would be greater under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative, and would remain significant and unavoidable.

Biological Resources

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar amount of disturbance of land. Although less right-of-way would be required for the Limited Access Conventional Highway than would be required for Freeway and Freeway ramps and interchanges, this land would likely be developed for some other type of land use. Similar to the proposed General Plan, the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would be required to mitigate impacts in accordance with the Western Riverside MSHCP. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.4 would reduce impacts related to sensitive or special status species, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, federally protected wetlands, or wildlife corridors to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Furthermore, implementation of this alternative would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or conflict with the provisions of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Overall, impacts to biological resources would be similar under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Cultural Resources

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar amount of disturbance of undeveloped land. Although less right-of-way would be required for the Limited Access Conventional Highway than would be required for Freeway and Freeway ramps and interchanges this land would likely be developed for some other type of land use. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.5 would mitigate impacts related to historical resources, archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to cultural

resources would be similar under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Geology/Soils and Mineral Resources

The Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would cover the same development footprint as the proposed General Plan. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.6 would mitigate impacts related to geologic, seismic, and soils hazards to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. This alternative would not propose additional development outside of the Planning Area not described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan. Therefore, this alternative would only develop land classified as MRZ-1 as described in Section 5.6 and would not have any significant impacts on mineral resources. Overall, impacts to geology/soils and mineral resources would be similar under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would allow for a similar level of development, creating a similar level of potential impact with respect to hazardous materials, fires, and flooding. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.7 would mitigate impacts related to hazardous materials, fires, and flooding to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Implementation of the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative as opposed to the freeway associated with the proposed General Plan would generate approximately 30,000 to 50,000 fewer vpd which would reduce the risk of accidents along the roadway, as well as the potential for hazardous materials to be released into the environment during an accident. However, a risk of major accident would still exist, which would be a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.7 would mitigate impacts related to emergency response to a level less than significant. Overall, impacts to vehicular hazards and the transportation of hazardous materials would be less under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Implementation of this alternative would create a similar amount of impervious surfaces in the Planning Area which would contribute runoff that could potentially exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, substantially alter the existing drainage patterns in the City or degrade or deplete groundwater or surface water resources. A similar amount of pollutants and run-off would be generated under this alternative as well that could impact water quality or water discharge requirements. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.8 would mitigate impacts related to the existing drainage system, existing drainage pattern, surface water resources, groundwater resources, water quality, or waste discharge requirements to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to hydrology/water quality would be similar under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Land Use

The Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would utilize the same land use categories shown and described in Section 5.9. However, the narrower right-of-way associated with the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would generate approximately 30,000 to 50,000 fewer VPD through San Jacinto, require less right-of-way width, and provide more at-grade crossing points with San Jacinto's local arterials. Therefore, the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would be less likely to divide an established community due to the narrower right-of-way, fewer VPD, greater number of at-grade crossing points relative to the proposed General Plan. Because the proposed land use designations under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of the Western Riverside County MSHCP and would have similar impacts associated with consistency with the existing Zoning Ordinance. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.9 would mitigate impacts related to conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to land use would be less under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative.

Noise

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of urban development in the Planning Area and accompanying impacts associated with noise. The potential for vehicular noise impact in the community would be greater since the reduced capacity of the Limited Access Conventional Highway would generate more traffic congestion the proposed General Plan. This would be a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.10 would mitigate noise impacts related to exceedances of the City of San Jacinto Noise Standards to a level less than significant. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.10 would mitigate all other noise impacts to a level similar to the proposed general plan. This would include impacts related to exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, creation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, or creation of substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Overall, localized vehicular noise impacts adjacent to the SR-79 would be greater under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative.

Population and Housing

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of development in the Planning Area and accompanying levels of housing and population as the proposed General Plan. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would not displace a substantial number of existing housing units or people. However, similar to the proposed project, implementation of the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would induce substantial population growth. This would create a significant and unavoidable impact associated with population and housing. Overall, impacts to population and housing would be similar under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Public Services and Recreation

Implementation of this alternative would place similar demand on the public services providers, including police protection, fire protection, schools, libraries, and recreation and open space. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.12 would mitigate impacts related to public services and recreation to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to public services and recreation would be similar under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Transportation

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of development in the Planning Area and accompanying number of trips generated by development in the Planning Area. However, the limited capacity of the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative would generate more traffic congestion than the freeway. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in section 5.13 would mitigate impacts related to future intersection service levels, roadway design and emergency access, and alternative transportation to a level less than significant. However, this alternative would still likely have impacts to the two roadway segments that would be significant and unavoidable identified in Section 5.13. Overall, localized impacts to traffic would be greater under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative, and would remain significant and unavoidable.

Utilities and Services System

Implementation of this alternative would place similar demand on the utilities services providers, including water supply, sewer services, solid waste services, power services, and communication services because a similar level of development would occur. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.14 would mitigate impacts related to utilities and services system to a level similar to the proposed general Plan. Overall, impacts to utilities and services system would be similar under the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Conclusion

Implementation of this alternative would allow a similar level of residential and non-residential development to occur in the Planning Area. This alternative would meet the project objectives of preserving the natural assets and historic resources of our valley, ensuring managed growth and the provision of adequate services and facilities at the time development occurs, maintaining the safety and security of our neighborhoods, promoting the development of quality educational facilities through increased cooperation between the City and school districts, and providing for recreation and healthy lifestyles. The Alternative State Route 79 - Limited Access Conventional Highway alternative would include the additional implementation policies developed for the amended general plan. However, the reduced number of trips generated by the Limited Access Conventional Highway Alternative may not achieve the goal of achieving high quality growth and economic development to the same degree as the proposed General Plan. This alternative would result in less impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials and land use and greater impacts associated with air quality, noise, and transportation. All other impacts would be similar to the environmental impacts associated with the proposed General Plan.

Based on this balance of factors and the severity of the impacts, overall this alternative would be environmentally inferior to the proposed project.

6.3 Agricultural Preservation Program

Description of Alternative

This alternative assumes development of the Planning Area pursuant to the proposed General Plan land uses, policies and Implementation Programs. However, one additional program, an Agricultural Preservation Program, would be adopted and implemented by the City. The intent of this program would be to preserve approximately half (or 400 acres) of the potentially impacted Prime Farmland in the community. This program would require the City to identify appropriate locations for agricultural preservation in the community and future developers of Prime Farmland to either maintain a certain portion of their land as working agriculture or pay an in-lieu fee for off-site preservation and the continued operation of agricultural resources. Large contiguous areas of Prime Farmland already in agricultural production and/or containing preserve status would be sought (see Figures 5.2-1 and 5.2-2 of this EIR). This program would require voluntary cooperation by private property owners interested in preserving their land in agricultural production as well as active pursuit of funding sources, such as the federal and State preservation programs and private trusts. This alternative is analyzed within this EIR as a means of reducing the impacts to agricultural resources in the Planning Area.

Comparison of Environmental Impacts to Proposed Project

Aesthetics

Implementation of this alternative would result in less development in the Planning Area and accompanying impacts associated with aesthetics because approximately 400 more acres of Prime Farmland would be maintained in agricultural production and not converted to urban uses under this alternative. This could reduce aesthetics impacts associated with the rural character of the community and light and glare impacts. However, implementation of the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative would still create impacts to scenic vistas and the visual character and quality of the City of San Jacinto. Development pursuant to the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative would have to comply with the City's Lighting Regulations that are contained within the Zoning Ordinance to reduce light and glare impacts to less than significant and would not have any impacts associated with a State Scenic Highway. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.1, would reduce significant impacts to scenic vistas and the visual character and quality to a level less than significant. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.1 would reduce impacts to scenic vistas or the visual character or quality of San Jacinto to a level less than significant. Overall, impacts to aesthetic resources would be less under the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative.

Agricultural Resources

Overall, the implementation of this alternative would result in less development in the Planning Area because this alternative would preserve approximately 400 more acres of Prime Farmland in agricultural production than would occur with the proposed project. However, implementation of this alternative would still result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. Implementation of this alternative would also likely include the conversion of land zoned for agricultural uses and land protected under Williamson Act contracts to other land uses. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.2 would mitigate impacts to agricultural resources to the extent feasible. Although the proposed Agricultural Preservation Program and implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.2 would preserve 400 acres of agricultural resources and reduce impacts to agricultural resources to the extent feasible, implementation of this alternative would still allow a significant and unmitigable conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses. Overall, impacts to agricultural resources would be less under the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative, but remain significant and unavoidable.

Air Quality

Overall, the implementation of this alternative would result in less development in the Planning Area and associated vehicular and stationary air quality emissions because approximately 400 acres of land that would have been developed with urban development would be maintained in agricultural production. Although impacts related to dust and fine particulate matter would be greater due to the farming operations that would remain under this alternative, the smaller development footprint and fewer accompanying vehicle trips associated with the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative would create less vehicular emissions than the proposed General Plan. However, project level and cumulative impacts would likely remain significant and unavoidable, like the proposed project. Overall, air quality impacts would be less under the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative, but remain significant and unavoidable.

Biological Resources

Overall, the implementation of this alternative would result in less development in the Planning Area and a similar overall area of land disturbance. Agricultural lands, by their nature, provide habitat of value to a limited range of sensitive species, particularly foraging birds and raptors. Therefore, preservation of additional land in agricultural production would provide an increased benefit to a limited number of sensitive biological resources in the Planning Area. This alternative would be required to be consistent with the mitigation efforts established by the Western Riverside MSHCP. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.4 would mitigate impacts related to sensitive or special status species, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, federally protected wetlands, or wildlife corridors to a level less than significant. Furthermore, implementation of this alternative would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or conflict with the provisions of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Overall, impacts to biological resources would be less under the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative.

Cultural Resources

Overall, the implementation of this alternative would result in less development and overall land disturbance in the Planning Area, reducing the number of archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains that would be impacted. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.5 would mitigate impacts related to historical resources, archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains to a level less than significant. Overall, impacts to historic resources would be similar under this alternative and the proposed General Plan, while impacts to archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would be less under the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative.

Geology/Soils and Mineral Resources

Implementation of this alternative would result in less development in the Planning Area and less people and property that would be subjected to geology/soils hazards. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.6 would mitigate impacts related to geologic, seismic, and soils hazards to a level less than significant. This alternative would not propose additional development outside of the Planning Area not described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan. Therefore, this alternative would only develop land classified as MRZ-1 as described in Section 5.6 and would not have any significant impacts on mineral resources. Overall, impacts to geology/soils and mineral resources would be less under the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative because fewer homes and people would be subjected to geologic and seismic hazards.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Implementation of this alternative would result in less development in the Planning Area, creating fewer potential impacts with respect to hazardous materials, fires, and flooding. Implementation of this alternative would also result in fewer homes and associated resident population as a result of the approximately 400-acres of land that would be retained for agricultural preservation. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.7 would mitigate impacts related to hazardous materials, fires, flooding, and emergency response to a level less than significant. Overall, impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be slightly less under the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Implementation of this alternative would create a smaller amount of impervious surfaces in the Planning Area, which would allow more water to infiltrate into groundwater resources, but would generate a similar amount of pollutants and run-off. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.8 would mitigate impacts related to hydrology, surface water resources, and groundwater resources to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to hydrology/water quality would be similar under this alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Land Use

Implementation of this alternative would preserve 400 acres of land for agricultural uses that is designated for urban development under the proposed General Plan. The Agricultural Preservation Program alternative would utilize the same land use categories and acreage distribution shown and described in Section 5.9. Similar to the proposed project, the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative would not divide an established community nor would it conflict with the provisions of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Because the proposed land use designations under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project, similar impacts associated with consistency with the existing Zoning Ordinance would occur. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.9 would mitigate impacts related to conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to land use would be similar under this alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Noise

Implementation of this alternative would result in less urban development in the Planning Area and accompanying impacts associated with noise. Although agricultural operations have the potential to generate operational noise that would not otherwise occur with urban development, the potential for vehicular noise impact in the community would be less for this alternative since fewer vehicular trips would be generated from the approximately 400-acres of land to be preserved as agriculture. However, this would still be a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.10 would mitigate noise impacts related to exceedances of the City of San Jacinto Noise Standards to a level less than significant. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.10 would mitigate all other noise related impacts to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. This would include impacts related to exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, creation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, or creation of substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Overall, noise impacts would be less under the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative.

Population and Housing

Implementation of this alternative would result in less development in the Planning Area and accompanying levels of housing and population than the proposed General Plan. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative would not displace a substantial number of existing housing units or people. However, similar to the proposed project, implementation of the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative would induce substantial population growth. This would create a significant and unavoidable impact to population and housing. Overall, impacts associated with population and housing would be less under the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative because it would develop fewer homes and associated resident population as a result of the approximately 400 acres of land that would be retained for agricultural preservation.

Public Services and Recreation

Implementation of this alternative would place less demand on the public services providers, including police protection, fire protection, schools, libraries, and recreation and open space. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.12 would mitigate impacts related to public services and recreation to a level less than significant. Overall, impacts to public services and recreation would be less under the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative.

Transportation

Implementation of this alternative would result in less development in the Planning Area and accompanying number of trips in the Planning Area as a result of the approximately 400-acres of land that would be retained for agricultural preservation. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in section 5.13 would mitigate impacts related to future intersection service levels, roadway design and emergency access, and alternative transportation to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. However, this alternative would have similar impacts to the two regional roadways segments that would be significant and unavoidable identified in Section 5.13. Overall, impacts to traffic would be less under the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative.

Utilities and Services System

Implementation of this alternative would place less demand on the utilities services providers, including water supply, sewer services, solid waste services, power services, and communication services. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.14 would mitigate impacts related to utilities and services system to a level less than significant. Overall, impacts to utilities and services system would be less under the Agricultural Preservation Program Alternative.

Conclusion

This alternative would allow less residential and non-residential development to occur in the Planning Area. This alternative would meet the project objectives of preserving the natural assets and historic resources of our valley, ensuring managed growth and the provision of adequate services and facilities at the time development occurs, maintaining the safety and security of our neighborhoods, promoting the development of quality educational facilities through increased cooperation between the City and school districts, and providing for recreation and healthy lifestyles. Implementing this alternative would result in less impacts associated with all categories except hydrology/water quality and land use. All other impacts would be similar to the environmental impacts associated with the proposed General Plan. Based on this balance of factors and the severity of the impacts, overall this alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project.

6.4 Clustered Development Alternative

Description of Alternative

This alternative assumes development of the Planning Area pursuant to the proposed General Plan land uses, policies and Implementation Programs. The Clustered Development Alternative would provide increased density and residential development in parcels designated for commercial uses under the proposed General Plan along corridors such as Sanderson Avenue and SR-79. This alternative would not result in an increase in the number of residential units, but rather would cluster more residential along transit corridors in higher densities and allow other residential development in the outskirts of the Planning Area to develop at lower densities. The intent of this program is to reduce both the length and amount of vehicle trips within the community by locating residential land uses, commercial land uses, and places of employment in proximity to each other. This program would require the City to identify appropriate locations for clustered development and to develop feasible future development plans that integrate residential land uses, commercial land uses, and places of employment with transportation nodes while preserving other land. This alternative is analyzed within this EIR as a means of reducing the impacts to agricultural resources, air quality, and transportation in the Planning Area.

Comparison of Environmental Impacts to Proposed Project

Aesthetics

Implementation of this alternative would cluster future development along transportation corridors and may potentially cluster higher density development along transportation corridors and lower density larger lots in the rest of the Planning Area. This could reduce aesthetics impacts associated with disturbing the rural character of the community and result in fewer light sources in the "outskirts" of the community and reduce light and glare impacts. However, implementation of the Clustered Development Alternative would still create impacts to scenic vistas and the visual character and quality of the City of San Jacinto because ultimately a majority of currently vacant and farming land would be converted to urban uses. Development pursuant to the Clustered Development Alternative would have to comply with the City's Lighting Regulations that are contained within the Zoning Ordinance to reduce light and glare impacts to less than significant and would not have any impacts associated with a State Scenic Highway. This alternative would implement the mitigation measures described in Section 5.1 to mitigate impacts to scenic vistas and the visual character or quality of San Jacinto to a level less than significant. Overall, impacts to aesthetic resources would be less under the Clustered Density Alternative.

Agricultural Resources

Implementation of this alternative would cluster future development along transportation corridors which may preserve some existing agricultural resources that otherwise would be converted to other uses under the proposed project. However, the agricultural resources preserved under this alternative would likely be dispersed throughout the Planning Area rather than located in a concentrated area. Furthermore, implementation of this alternative

would still result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. Implementation of this alternative would also likely include the conversion of land zoned for agricultural uses and land protected under Williamson Act contracts to other land uses. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.2 would mitigate impacts to agricultural resources to the extent feasible. Although the proposed Clustered Development Alternative and implementation of the mitigation measures in Section 5.2 may preserve some existing agricultural resources and reduce impacts to agricultural resources to the extent feasible, implementation of this alternative would still allow a significant and unmitigable conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses. Overall, impacts to agricultural resources would be less under the Clustered Density Alternative, but remain significant and unavoidable.

Air Quality

Implementation of this alternative would cluster future development along transportation corridors and may potentially reduce the number of vehicle trips within the Planning Area. Consequently, localized vehicular air quality impacts would be less under this alternative due to the increased access to alternative modes of transportation and increased number of non-vehicular trips resulting from mixed use development that locates commercial and residential uses in proximity to each other. However, project level and cumulative impacts would likely remain significant and unavoidable, like the proposed project. Overall, air quality impacts would be less under the Clustered Density Alternative, but remain significant and unavoidable.

Biological Resources

Implementation of this alternative would cluster future development along transportation corridors and may potentially disturb fewer biological resources in the outlying areas of the community. This could potentially preserve existing habitats that otherwise may be developed under the proposed General Plan. Additionally, agricultural lands, by their nature, provide habitat of value to a limited range of sensitive species, particularly foraging birds and raptors. Therefore, preservation of agricultural resources that otherwise may be converted to other uses under the proposed project would provide an increased benefit to a limited number of sensitive biological resources in the Planning Area. This alternative would be required to be consistent with the mitigation efforts established by the MSHCP. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.4 would mitigate impacts related to sensitive or special status species, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, federally protected wetlands, or wildlife corridors to a level less than significant. Furthermore, implementation of this alternative would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or conflict with the provisions of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Overall, impacts to biological resources would be less under the Clustered Density Alternative.

Cultural Resources

Implementation of this alternative would cluster future development along transportation corridors and may potentially reduce the number of archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains that would be impacted. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.5 would mitigate impacts related to historical resources, archeological resources, paleontological resources, or human remains to a level

less than significant. Overall, impacts to historic resources would be similar under this alternative and the proposed General Plan, while impacts to archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would be less under the Clustered Density Alternative.

Geology/Soils and Mineral Resources

Implementation of this alternative would cover the same development footprint as the proposed General Plan. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.6 would mitigate impacts related to geologic, seismic, and soils hazards to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. This alternative would not propose additional development outside of the Planning Area not described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan. Therefore, this alternative would only develop land classified as MRZ-1 as described in Section 5.6 and would not have any significant impacts on mineral resources. Overall, impacts to geology/soils and mineral resources would be similar under the Clustered Density Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Implementation of this alternative would cluster future development along transportation corridors and may potentially reduce the amount of development that could be exposed to the threat of wildland fires. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.7 would mitigate impacts related to hazardous materials, fires, flooding and emergency response to a level less than significant. Overall, impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be less under the Clustered Density Alternative.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Implementation of this alternative would create a slightly smaller amount of impervious surfaces in the Planning Area, which would allow more water to infiltrate into groundwater resources, but would generate a similar amount of pollutants and run-off. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.8 would mitigate impacts related to hydrology, surface water resources, and groundwater resources to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to hydrology/water quality would be similar under the Clustered Density Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Land Use

The Clustered Development alternative would utilize many of the same land use categories described in Section 5.9, but would provide increased density and residential development in parcels designated for commercial uses under the proposed General Plan along corridors such as Sanderson Avenue and SR-79. This alternative would not result in an increase in the number of residential units, but rather would cluster more residential along transit corridors in higher densities and allow other residential development in the outskirts of the Planning Area to develop at lower densities. Similar to the proposed project, the Clustered Development Alternative would not divide an established community nor would it conflict with the provisions of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Because some of the proposed land use designations under this alternative would be different from those of the proposed project, the Clustered Density Alternative may create additional impacts

associated with consistency with the existing Zoning Ordinance. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.9 would mitigate impacts related to conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to land use would be similar under the Clustered Density Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Noise

Implementation of this alternative would cluster future development along transportation corridors and allow other residential development in the outskirts of the Planning Area to develop at lower densities. Although this development pattern may reduce the amount of noise associated with vehicle trips in the outskirts of the Planning Area, this reduction would be offset by potential impacts related to sensitive receptors clustered along transportation corridors exposed to greater noise levels associated with major transportation nodes. This would be a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.10 would mitigate impacts related to exceedances of the City of San Jacinto Noise Standards to the extent feasible. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.10 would mitigate all other noise impacts to a level similar to the proposed general plan. This would include impacts related to exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, creation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, or creation of substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Overall, noise impacts would be greater under the Clustered Density Alternative.

Population and Housing

Implementation of this alternative would provide increased density and residential development in parcels designated for commercial uses under the proposed General Plan along corridors such as Sanderson Avenue and SR-79. This alternative would not result in an increase in the number of residential units, but rather would cluster more residential along transit corridors in higher densities and allow other residential development in the outskirts of the Planning Area to develop at lower densities. While this alternative would reduce the amount of vehicle trips, it would still result in the same amount of accompanying levels of housing and population as the proposed General Plan. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of the Clustered Development Alternative would not displace a substantial number of existing housing units or people. However, similar to the proposed project, implementation of the Clustered Development Alternative would induce substantial population growth. This would create a significant and unavoidable impact to population and housing. Overall, impacts to population and housing would be similar under the Clustered Development Alternative and the proposed General Plan, remaining significant and unavoidable.

Public Services and Recreation

This alternative would place similar demand on the public services providers, including police protection, fire protection, schools, libraries, and recreation and open space. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.12 would mitigate impacts related to public services and recreation to a level of similar to the proposed

General Plan. Overall, impacts to public services and recreation would be similar under the Clustered Density Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Transportation

Implementation of this alternative would cluster future development along transportation corridors and may potentially reduce the number of vehicle trips in the Planning Area. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in section 5.13 would mitigate impacts related to future intersection service levels, roadway design and emergency access, and alternative transportation to a level similar to the proposed General Plan. However, this alternative would have similar impacts to the two regional roadways segments that would be significant and unavoidable identified in Section 5.13. Overall, impacts to traffic would be less under the Clustered Density Alternative, but remain significant and unavoidable.

Utilities and Services System

This alternative would place similar demand on the utilities services providers, including water supply, sewer services, solid waste services, power services, and communication services. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 5.14 would mitigate impacts to utilities and services system to a level of similar to the proposed General Plan. Overall, impacts to utilities and services system would be similar under the Clustered Density Alternative and the proposed General Plan.

Conclusion

Implementation of this alternative would provide increased density and residential development in parcels designated for commercial uses under the proposed General Plan along corridors such as Sanderson Avenue and SR-79. This alternative would not result in an increase in the number of residential units, but rather would cluster more residential along transit corridors in higher densities and allow other residential development in the outskirts of the Planning Area to develop at lower densities. This alternative would meet the project objectives of preserving the natural assets and historic resources of our valley, ensuring managed growth and the provision of adequate services and facilities at the time development occurs, maintaining the safety and security of our neighborhoods, promoting the development of quality educational facilities through increased cooperation between the City and school districts, and providing for recreation and healthy lifestyles. Implementation of this alternative would result in less impacts associated with aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and transportation, while impacts related to noise would be greater. All other impacts would be similar to the environmental impacts associated with the proposed General Plan. Based on this balance of factors and the severity of the impacts, overall this alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project.