

Chapter 6 **ALTERNATIVES**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an EIR describe and evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, or alternatives to the location of the proposed project. The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to explore ways that most of the basic objectives of the proposed project could be attained while reducing or avoiding significant environmental impacts of the project as proposed. This approach is intended to foster informed decision-making and public participation in the environmental process.

This chapter evaluates alternatives to the proposed project and examines the potential environmental impacts associated with each alternative. The CEQA Guidelines indicate that EIRs are required to evaluate a "...range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project" (Section 15126.6[a] CEQA Guidelines). Not every conceivable alternative must be addressed, nor do infeasible alternatives need to be considered. When addressing feasibility, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines states that the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, other plans or regulatory limitations, and jurisdictional boundaries. The Guidelines also state that the discussion of alternatives should focus on "...alternatives capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives could impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly" (Section 15166.6[b] CEQA Guidelines). CEQA further directs that "...the significant effects of the alternatives shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed" (Section 15126.6[d] CEQA Guidelines).

The following sections discuss the project alternatives that were considered pursuant to CEQA and developed by the City of San Dimas. Based on the CEQA Guidelines, the following four project alternatives to avoid or reduce significant project impacts were identified and are discussed in Section 6.2.1) No Project (No Build) Alternative; 2) Reduced Project (38 lots) Alternative; 3) Development Configuration Alternative; and 4) Improved Emergency Access Alternative.

6.1 Project Objectives

As stated in the Project Description, the fundamental project objectives for the proposed project are:

1. To implement the Settlement Agreement by amending the San Dimas General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25 to modify residential densities, development standards, land use goals and policies, and other provisions.
2. To adopt amendments to the General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25 that are sensitive to the unique character of the Northern Foothills, particularly with respect to visual, open space and biological resources, while meeting the parties obligations under the Settlement Agreement.
3. To establish residential density and development standards (including two-story structures) that permit the construction of a single-family residential project that also provides amenities to the community in the form of multi-use trails, connective trail access to adjacent properties and open space for habitat conservation and/or recreational uses.
4. To focus residential densities predominantly in areas that the General Plan and Specific Plan have identified as “Development Feasibility Areas” (see General Plan Exhibit II-5.2) or which meet the standards set forth for Development Feasibility Area’s and are also in the closest proximity to existing development and infrastructure.
5. To focus development, residential access roads, grading and residential lot locations into areas that are less visually intrusive than may have otherwise occurred under the “San Dimas Concept Lotting Plan” that is part of the Settlement Agreement.
6. To consolidate and increase opportunities for open space on the project site by allowing clustered development, two-story structures, and smaller lot sizes and identifying “no build areas” on residential lots.
7. To enhance the fire protection in the Northern Foothills through development of new water systems, water storage tanks, fire hydrants, paved public and private accesses, brush clearances, turnouts, turnarounds, improved emergency access points, fuel modification zones, debris removal and maintenance.
8. To accommodate new development that is coordinated with the provision of infrastructure and public improvements.

6.2 Alternatives Analyzed

This section presents an evaluation of four alternatives to the proposed project: 1) No Project (No Build) Alternative; 2) the Reduced Project (38 lots) Alternative; 3) the Development Configuration Alternative; and 4) the Improved Emergency Access Alternative. For each alternative, a brief description is first presented, followed by a summary impact analysis relative to the proposed project, and an assessment of the degree to which the alternative would meet the proposed project objectives. Following the discussion of all of the issues, Table 6-1 provides a comparison of the significant direct impacts that would result from the proposed project and the impacts that would result from each of the analyzed alternatives in relation to the proposed project. Table 6-2 provides a summary of the selected alternatives’ abilities to meet the proposed project objectives.

6.2.1 No Project (No Build) Alternative

Impact Analysis

CEQA requires the No Project Alternative to be addressed in an EIR. Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not be implemented and the proposed project site would remain in its existing undeveloped condition. No amendments to the San Dimas General Plan or Specific Plan No. 25 would occur.

Aesthetics

The No Project Alternative would not result in any significant impacts associated with aesthetics because it would not alter the existing character of the project site or its surroundings.

As evaluated in Section 4.1.4 (Aesthetics) of this EIR, a significant cumulative impact exists within the geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regards to regional hillside development. However, because no development would occur on the proposed project site, this alternative's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

Air Quality

The No Project Alternative would not result in significant impacts to air quality because this alternative would not involve the use of heavy construction equipment during site preparation and grading activities. As evaluated in Section 4.2.4 (Air Quality) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to federal and state ambient air quality standards and sensitive receptors would be significant, while cumulative impacts to regional air quality plans and objectionable odors would be less than significant. However, because no development would occur on the proposed project site and there would be no substantial increases in the number of vehicles to and from the proposed project site, the emission levels of the No Project Alternative would be similar to those of the existing condition. Therefore, the cumulatively considerable contribution of existing pollutant emissions to the non-attainment Basin under the No Project Alternative would be less than that of the proposed project.

Biological Resources

The No Project Alternative would not result in any impacts to biological resources (special status plant, special status animals, riparian habitats, wetlands, local policies, wildlife movement corridors, ordinances and habitat conservation plans). This is due to the fact that no development would occur under this alternative and existing site conditions would be maintained. Because no significant impacts would occur, a cumulatively considerable significant cumulative impact would not occur.

Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would not result in any ground disturbance or development on the project site and would therefore result in no impacts to cultural resources. Because no development would occur under this alternative, this alternative's contribution to significant cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Geology and Soils

The No Project Alternative would not result in impacts to geology or soils because it would not involve any new construction or ground disturbance. As evaluated in Section 4.5.4 (Geology and Soils) in the EIR, a significant cumulative impact related to seismic-related hazards exists. No development would occur under this alternative and this alternative's contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to geology and soils would not be cumulatively considerable.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The No Project Alternative would not result in GHG emissions or conflicts with applicable GHG plans or policies because this alternative would not involve the use of heavy construction equipment during site preparation and grading activities. Additionally, no operational GHG emissions would occur because no residential development would take place. As discussed in Section 4.6.4 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) in this EIR, due to the nature of assessment of GHG emissions and the effects of climate change, impacts can currently only be analyzed from a cumulative context. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in no cumulative impacts to GHG emissions or GHG plans or policies.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The No Project Alternative would not result in significant impacts related to hazardous materials, emergency access or wildland fires. The No Project Alternative would not develop any residential structures and would therefore not place people or structures in areas with wildland fire hazards or require emergency access to serve the project site. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not result in any usage of hazardous materials on the project site during construction or operation. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in no direct hazards or hazardous materials impacts.

As evaluated in Section 4.6.4 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) in this EIR, cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials, emergency access and wildland fires are less than significant. The No Project Alternative would result in no development on the project site, and would not increase the risk to people or structures from hazardous materials, inadequate emergency access or wildfire. Therefore, this alternative's contribution to a significant hazards and hazardous materials cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The No Project Alternative would have no impact on hydrology and water quality because no development would occur and the existing project site's hydrologic conditions would be maintained. As evaluated in Section 4.8.4 (Hydrology and Water Quality) in this EIR, significant cumulative impacts related to drainage alteration, erosion and siltation, surface water quality and flood hazards would occur. Because no development would occur on the project site under this alternative, hydrology and water quality impacts from the No Project Alternative would result in a contribution that is not cumulatively considerable to the significant cumulative impact.

Land Use and Planning

The No Project Alternative would not result in any inconsistencies with land use plans, policies, or regulations or be inconsistent with adjacent or surrounding land uses because no development would occur on the project site and no amendments to the General Plan or Specific Plan No. 25 would be

required. As evaluated in Section 4.9.4 (Land Use) in this EIR, cumulative impacts related to conflicts with land use plans and incompatibilities between adjacent land uses are less than significant. Because no development would occur under this alternative, no impacts to land use would occur and this alternative's contribution to cumulative land use impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Public Services

Under the No Project Alternative, no residential development would occur and existing public services would experience no increase in service demand. Therefore, no impacts to public services from the No Project Alternative would occur. As evaluated in Section 4.11.4 (Public Services) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to fire protection, police services, and public schools are significant. Because the residential population within the service provider's service area would not increase under this alternative, the demand for these services would not exceed the existing demand. Therefore, this alternative's contribution to significant cumulative impacts to public services would not be cumulatively considerable.

Transportation and Traffic

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed and no traffic would be generated on local roadways. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not result in any impacts to transportation and traffic. As evaluated in Section 4.11.4 (Transportation and Traffic), cumulative impacts due to emergency access, traffic increases, transportation hazards, and alternative transportation plans and policies are less than significant. Because this alternative would not increase the number of vehicles coming to or from the project site, this alternative's contribution to significant cumulative impacts to transportation and traffic would not be cumulatively considerable.

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy

The No Project Alternative would not result in any residential development and would therefore not result in any impacts to existing utilities, such as wastewater treatment, new water or wastewater facilities, new storm water facilities, water supply availability, landfill capacity or energy. As evaluated in Section 4.12.4 (Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to wastewater treatment, new water or wastewater facilities, new storm water facilities, water supply availability, and landfill capacity are less than significant. However, cumulative impacts to energy consumption are significant. Because the No Project Alternative would not result in any development, it would not increase the existing energy demand. Therefore, this alternative's contribution to significant cumulative impacts to energy demand would not be cumulatively considerable.

Ability to Accomplish Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative would accomplish none of the proposed project's objectives. Objective one, two, and three would not be met because the No Project Alternative would not require any amendments to the San Dimas General Plan or Specific Plan No. 25 and residential and development standards would remain unchanged. Objective four, five, six, seven and eight would not be met because no development would occur under this alternative, and therefore the project site would not provide development within Development Feasibility Areas and would not provide visually unobtrusive development, clustered development, enhanced fire protection, or enhanced infrastructure and public improvements.

6.2.2 Reduced Project Alternative (38 lots)

The Reduced Project Alternative would develop 38 residential lots on the proposed 270-acre project site. Seventeen homes would be clustered into a lower-lying valley that is situated in the central-western portion of the project site and the remaining homes would be distributed throughout the project site, generally along ridgelines and hillside peaks. When compared to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would locate more homes along ridgelines and hillside peaks. The Reduced Project Alternative would not provide access to the project site from Cataract Avenue and primary access to the site would be provided through Wildwood Motorway, from an area within the City of Glendora to the southwestern project site boundary. In order to make the site accessible, this alternative would require that Wildwood Motorway be paved on and off-site, and a 20-foot easement through the adjacent property to the west as well as approval from the City of Glendora would be required. Other existing motorways within the project site would also be paved and used for on-site site access and circulation. No other off-site roadways would be improved. The Reduced Project Alternative would have two emergency access points and one 0.18-acre fire turn-around. The first emergency access point would be located at the northwest project site boundary and the second access point would be located at the southeast project site boundary. These emergency access routes would cross through land owned by the County of Los Angeles and a private owner to the west, which is presently the applicant. The emergency access routes would not be improved off-site. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would include approximately 0.18 acres to the east of the center of the project site for use as a fire protection turn-around. This turn-around would require off-site improvements, located on Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation land. The off-site improvements associated with the 0.18-acre turn-around would require approval from the County of Los Angeles. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would provide public services and utilities, including fire protection services, police protection services, public schools services, water infrastructure, wastewater infrastructure, stormwater infrastructure, a Fuel Modification Plan and an equestrian trail. The Reduced Project Alternative would require amendments to the General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25 and approvals from the County of Los Angeles, the City of Glendora, and public service providers.

The Reduced Project Alternative was selected because of its similarity to some provisions of the Settlement Agreement Concept Lotting Plan, which proposes approximately 38 residential lots on 200 acres of land.

Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

The Reduced Project Alternative would substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site and surroundings by introducing residential development and infrastructure on hillsides and ridgelines. Even with implementation of mitigation measure Aes-1A, impacts to visual character and quality would remain significant and unavoidable. Although less total residential development would occur under this alternative, when compared to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in greater significant impacts to visual character and scenic vistas because more residences would be located on ridgelines, more residential development would be visible from off-site locations, and this alternative would result in the additional leveling of hilltops for building pads. However, due to the limited visibility of the project site from surrounding areas, it is anticipated that the Reduced Project

Alternative would result in less than significant impacts to scenic vistas, similar to the proposed project. Also similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in new sources of light and glare, which is considered a significant impact. However, this alternative would introduce less homes, streetlights, and vehicle lights than the proposed project and would therefore result in lesser lighting and glare impacts. Implementing mitigation measures Aes-3A through Aes-3E would reduce impacts to light and glare to a level below significant. However, the development of residences on hilltops and ridgelines under the Reduced Project Alternative would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

As evaluated in Section 4.1.4 (Aesthetics) of this EIR, a significant cumulative impact exists within the geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regards to visual character, scenic vistas and light and glare. This level of impact would remain the same under the Reduced Project Alternative. For the same reasons given in Section 4.1.4 for the proposed project, the contribution of the Reduced Project Alternative would not be cumulatively considerable to scenic vistas and light and glare with implementation of mitigation measures. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in a significantly cumulative contribution to visual character and quality.

Air Quality

Compared to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in a reduction in the production of air emissions, both during construction and after completion of the project site. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, impacts from the Reduced Project Alternative related to consistency with regional air quality plans and objectionable odors would be less than significant. Although this alternative would result in reduced air emissions than the proposed project, the construction and operational emissions associated with this alternative's 38 residential units would result in significant impacts to ambient air quality standards and sensitive receptors. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to air quality would be lessened through implementation of measures AQ-2A and AQ-2B; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

As evaluated in Section 4.2.4 (Air Quality) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to federal and state ambient air quality standards and sensitive receptors are considered significant, while cumulative impacts to regional air quality plans and objectionable odors are less than significant. Although the Reduced Project Alternative would result in a reduction of air emissions when compared to the proposed project, it would contribute air emissions in a quantity that would result in significant impacts without mitigation. Similar to the proposed project, the contribution of the Reduced Project Alternative to this significant impact would be cumulatively considerable, even with implementation of AQ-2A and AQ-2B.

Biological Resources

The Reduced Project Alternative would significantly impact sensitive plants, sensitive animals, sensitive vegetative communities, wetland and local policies, ordinances and habitat conservation plans due to vegetation removal associated with construction activities. Compared to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in similar impacts to biological resources because the same project site would undergo development, and a similar potential for wildlife and plant species to be impacted from construction and operation would occur. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would result in less than significant impacts to wildlife corridors. Significant impacts to biological resources would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation

measures: Bio-1A, Bio-1B, Bio-1C, Bio-1D, Bio-1E, Bio-1F, Bio-2A, Bio-2B, Bio-2C, Bio-3A, Bio-4A, Bio-4B, Bio-4C, Bio-4D, Bio-4E, and Bio-6A.

As evaluated in Section 4.3.4 (Biological Resources) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities, wetlands, and wildlife movement corridors are significant. Cumulative impacts related to local policies, ordinances and habitat conservation plans would be less than significant. Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would also impact sensitive plants, sensitive animals, sensitive vegetative communities, wetland and local policies, ordinances and habitat conservation plans due to vegetation removal associated with construction activities. Because the Reduced Project Alternative would have similar biological resources impacts as the proposed project and would implement the same mitigation measures, this alternative would result in a similar contribution to the significant cumulative impact, which is not be cumulatively considerable.

Cultural Resources

The Reduced Project Alternative would significantly impact cultural resources, including historical resources, archaeological resources, and paleontological resources, due to the ground disturbing activities related to construction of the 38 residential lots. Impacts to historical resources, archaeological resources and paleontological resources would be mitigable to a less than significant level with measures Cul-2A, Cul-4A, Cul-4B, and Cul-4C. When compared to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in similar cultural resources impacts because similar ground disturbing activities related to construction would occur. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would result in a less than significant impact to human remains.

Similar to the proposed project, after mitigation the Reduced Project Alternative cultural resources impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

Geology and Soils

Impacts related to geology and soils under the Reduced Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed project because the 38 residential units would occur on the same geologic site as the proposed project and similar construction techniques, such as grading, foundation construction and retaining wall construction, would be required. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in significant impacts related to seismic-related hazards, soil erosion and topsoil loss, soil and slope instability and expansive soils. Implementation of mitigation measures Geo-1A, Geo-2A, Geo-3A, Geo-3B and Geo-4A would reduce these impacts to a level below significant.

As evaluated in Section 4.5.4 (Geology and Soils) in the EIR, a significant cumulative impact related to seismic-related hazards exists. Because the Reduced Project Alternative would have the same geology and soils impacts as the proposed project and would implement the same mitigation measures, this alternative would result in a similar contribution to the significant cumulative impact, and would not be cumulatively considerable.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

When compared to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in lesser GHG emissions during construction because this alternative would require less use of heavy construction

equipment during site preparation and grading activities. The Reduced Project Alternative would also result in less operational emissions than the proposed project because operational emission sources would be reduced from 61 residences to 38 residences. Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in a less than significant impact related to GHG emissions and conflicts with adopted plans. Although the Reduced Project Alternative would result in less GHG emissions than the proposed project, the construction and operational emissions associated with the 38 residences would result in a significant climate change hazards impact. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of applicable mitigation measures in other sections of this EIR would reduce this impact to a level below significant.

As discussed in Section 4.6.4 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) in this EIR, due to the nature of assessment of GHG emissions and the effects of climate change, impacts can currently only be analyzed from a cumulative context. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to GHG emissions and conflicts with applicable plans would be less than significant and would not result in a cumulative contribution. With implementation of applicable mitigation measures in other sections of this EIR, impacts related to climate change hazards would be reduced to a level below significant and a cumulative contribution would not occur.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to hazardous materials because construction and operation of both scenarios would require the use of similar types of materials. Although the Reduced Project Alternative would result in the construction of fewer homes, it would also require the construction of a secondary emergency access route to meet City and LACoFD standards. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in the same significant emergency response plans and route impacts as the proposed project because none of the proposed off-site emergency access routes would be improved to meet City and LACoFD standards, and therefore these routes would be considered inadequate for the purpose of emergency access. Implementation of mitigation measure Tra-3A would lessen this impact to a level below significant. However, similar to the proposed project, if this mitigation measure is found to be infeasible the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Also similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would place structures and people in a location at risk of wildfire, which would be a significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure Haz-3A would reduce this impact to a level below significant.

As evaluated in Section 4.6.4 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) in this EIR, cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials, emergency response plans and wildfire fire hazards are less than significant. Because the Reduced Project Alternative would have the same impacts as the proposed project in terms of hazardous materials, emergency response plans and wildland fires, it would result in a similar contribution that is not cumulatively considerable.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would include on-site drainage improvements that would result in less than significant impacts related to drainage alteration, erosion and siltation, groundwater supply and recharge, surface water quality and flood hazards. When compared to the proposed project, this alternative would result in fewer surface water quality impacts because less impermeable space would be introduced to the project site, due to less homes being built.

Less impermeable surfaces would reduce the quantity of pollutants that could enter surface water from project runoff.

As evaluated in Section 4.8.4 (Hydrology and Water Quality) in this EIR, significant cumulative impacts related to drainage alteration, erosion and siltation, surface water quality and flood hazards exist. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to drainage alteration, erosion and siltation, groundwater supply and recharge, surface water quality and flood hazards. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution.

Land Use and Planning

The Reduced Project Alternative would require multiple amendments to the San Dimas General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25. This alternative would result in the same land use impact as the proposed project and upon approval of these amendments, no conflicts with applicable land use plans or policies would occur and this alternative would result in a less than significant impact. As evaluated in Section 4.9.4 (Land Use and Planning) in this EIR, cumulative impacts related to land use plans and incompatibilities between adjacent land uses are less than significant.

Public Services

The residential population under the Reduced Project Alternative would be less than that of the proposed project, and therefore demand on public services, including fire, police, and schools, would also be less than the proposed project. As discussed in Section 4.10 (Public Services), the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to fire protection, police protection and schools. Therefore, the Reduced Project Alternative impacts related to fire, police and schools would also be less than significant. The Reduced Project Alternative would also include the construction of a trail, and would therefore result in similar significant impacts to parks and trails. However, demand for park and trails facilities under this alternative would be less than the proposed project due to a lower population. Implementation of mitigation measures Pub-4A, Pub-4B, and applicable mitigation measures in the other sections of this EIR would reduce impacts related to parks and trails to a level below significance.

As evaluated in Section 4.10.4 (Public Services) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to fire protection, police services, public schools and parks and trails are less than significant. With implementation of mitigation measures Pub-4A, Pub-4B, and applicable mitigation measures in the other sections of this EIR, the Reduced Project Alternative's cumulative impact would be reduced to a level below significance.

Transportation and Traffic

When compared to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in fewer total vehicle trips generated to and from the project site, due to less residential homes being developed. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in a less than significant impact related to increases in traffic, due to the minimal amount of vehicle trips anticipated to occur from the construction of homes. Due to the steep topography of the project site, the Reduced Project Alternative has the potential for visibility hazards to occur as the proposed project, even when using existing motorways rather than Cataract Avenue. Similar to the proposed project, this would be considered a significant impact and implementation of mitigation measure Tra-2A and Tra-2B would be

required to reduce this impact to a level below significant. Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would not improve off-site emergency access roadways, which are currently not adequate to address the increased demand for emergency access associated with the proposed project. Implementation of Tra-3A would lessen emergency access impacts from the Reduced Project Alternative to a level below significant. However, similar to the proposed project, if mitigation measure Tra-3A is found to be infeasible impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would construct a trail and would have similar less than significant impacts related to alternative transportation plans and policies.

As evaluated in Section 4.11.4 (Transportation and Traffic), cumulative impacts related to traffic increases, transportation hazards, emergency access and alternative transportation plans and policies are less than significant.

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy

The residential population under the Reduced Project Alternative would be less than that of the proposed project and the associated demand for wastewater treatment, new water or wastewater facilities, new storm water facilities, water supply availability, landfill capacity and energy consumption would also be less than that of the proposed project. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to wastewater treatment, water supply availability and landfill capacity. The Reduced Project Alternative would also result in less than significant impacts to these issues. Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would require the construction of on-site stormwater, water, wastewater and energy facilities, which would be considered a significant impact. However, lesser environmental impacts would occur under this alternative because fewer infrastructures would be required to serve the development. Implementation of applicable mitigation measures in other sections of this EIR would reduce impacts related to the construction of the Reduced Project Alternative's utilities to a level below significance.

As evaluated in Section 4.12.4 (Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to wastewater treatment, new water or wastewater facilities, new storm water facilities, water supply availability, and landfill capacity are less than significant. However, cumulative impacts related to energy consumption are significant. Because the Reduced Project Alternative would result in less development and energy demand than the proposed project, which was determined to have a less than significant cumulative impact, this alternative's contribution to cumulative impacts would also not be cumulatively considerable.

Ability to Accomplish Project Objectives

The Reduced Project Alternative would be consistent with four of the eight project objectives and partially consistent with two of the project objectives. Objective one and three would be met because this alternative would also require amendments to the San Dimas General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25 that would establish new residential density standards, among other things, for the project site. This alternative would not meet objective two because more residences would be located along primary ridgelines and, unlike the proposed project, it would not designate an 83-acre parcel of land for open space. Objective four would only be partially met by this alternative because, although the project site is the same as the proposed project, it would develop fewer within Development Feasibility Areas.

Objective five would not be met by the Reduced Project Alternative, because this development concept is similar to the 'San Dimas Concept Lotting Plan'. Objective six would only be partially met by the Reduced Project Alternative because, although residences would be clustered, which would consolidate and increase opportunities for open space, residential clustering would occur on a lesser degree than the proposed project. Objective seven would be met because this alternative includes a Fuel Management Plan and emergency access routes, which would enhance fire protection in the Northern Foothills. Objective eight would also be met because this alternative would include the provision of infrastructure and public improvements to serve the development.

6.2.3 Development Configuration Alternative

The Development Configuration Alternative would have essentially the same site plan as the proposed project (see Figure 3-1, Proposed Project Site Plan). However, under this alternative, each building pad (disturbance area) would be reduced by 10 percent in size while total lot sizes would remain similar to the proposed project. Additionally, the grading scheme for the Development Configuration Alternative would be significantly reduced by approximately 300,000 to 400,000 cubic yards of cut and fill. The proposed project would require approximately 1,300,000 cubic yards of grading. When compared to the proposed project, this alternative would increase roadway grades and require fewer retaining walls. The Development Configuration Alternative would have four emergency access routes, two that cross County of Los Angeles land and two that cross City of Glendora land. No off-site roadway improvements for emergency access would occur under this alternative. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would provide public services and utilities, including fire protection services, police protection services, public schools services, water infrastructure, wastewater infrastructure, stormwater infrastructure, a Fuel Modification Plan and an equestrian trail. The Development Configuration Alternative would require amendments to the General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25 and approvals from the County of Los Angeles and public service providers.

The Alternative Development Configuration is considered in the analysis of alternatives for the purpose of reducing the following significant impacts associated with the proposed project: aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources and greenhouse gas emissions.

Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

The site plan for the Alternative Development Configuration is essentially the same as that of the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to visual character, scenic vistas, and lighting and glare would be similar to the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures Aes-1A and Aes-3A through Aes-3E would reduce impacts related to scenic vistas and lighting and glare to a level below significant. Even with implementation of mitigation measure Aes-1A, visual character and quality impacts under the Development Configuration Alternative would remain significant and unavoidable because residential development would be located in the same locations as the proposed project. When compared to the proposed project, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in less landform alteration because the grading scheme would be significantly reduced to avoid leveling the tops of some hills to prepare building pads. In addition, less grading would result in the use of less retaining walls, which would lessen views that may not be consistent with natural features and

landforms. Therefore, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in fewer visual character and quality and scenic vista impacts than the proposed project. However, visual impacts under this alternative would still be considered significant and unavoidable. When compared to the proposed project, the Alternative Development Configuration would result in the same impacts to lighting and glare, because the same number of homes would be built.

As evaluated in Section 4.1.4 (Aesthetics) of this EIR, a significant cumulative impact exists within the geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regards to visual character and quality, scenic vistas and light and glare. This level of impact would remain the same under the Alternative Development Configuration. For the same reasons given in Section 4.1.4 for the proposed project, the contribution of the Development Configuration Alternative would not be cumulatively considerable to scenic vistas and light and glare with implementation of mitigation measures. The Development Configuration Alternative would result in a significantly cumulative contribution to visual character and quality.

Air Quality

Compared to the proposed project, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in a reduction in the production of air emissions during construction due to the substantial reduction in site grading. After construction, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in the same operational emissions as the proposed project because the same number of residences would be constructed. Although this project would result in less construction related emissions than the proposed project, it is probable that construction impacts related to ambient air quality standards and sensitive receptors would remain significant. Although this alternative would result in less grading than the proposed project, it is still anticipated that ambient air quality standards and sensitive receptors impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, even after implementation of mitigation measures AQ-2A and AQ-2B. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to consistency with regional plans and objectionable odors would be less than significant.

As evaluated in Section 4.2.4 (Air Quality) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to ambient air quality standards and sensitive receptors would be significant, while cumulative impacts to regional plans and objectionable odors would be less than significant. Although the Development Configuration Alternative would result in a reduction of air emissions, it is unlikely it would do so to a level below significance without mitigation. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, the contribution of the Development Configuration Alternative to this significant impact would be cumulatively considerable, even with implementation of AQ-2A and AQ-2B.

Biological Resources

Compared to the proposed project, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in similar significant impacts with regard to sensitive plants, sensitive animals, sensitive vegetative communities, wetland and local policies, ordinances and habitat conservation plans because the site plan for this alternative would be essentially the same as that of the proposed project. Also similar to the proposed project, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to wildlife corridors. Impacts to sensitive plants, sensitive animals, sensitive vegetative communities, wetland and local policies, ordinances and habitat conservation plans from the Development Configuration Alternative would be mitigated by implementing mitigation measures Bio-1A, Bio-1B, Bio-1C, Bio-1D, Bio-1E, Bio-1F, Bio-2A, Bio-2B, Bio-3A, Bio-3B, Bio-4A, Bio-4B, Bio-4C, Bio-4-D, Bio-4E and

Bio-6A. With implementation of these measures, biological resources impacts from the Development Configuration Alternative would be less than significant.

As evaluated in Section 4.3.4 (Biological Resources) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities, wetlands, and wildlife movement corridors are significant. Cumulative impacts related to local policies, ordinances and habitat conservation plans would be less than significant. Similar to the proposed project, the Development Configuration Alternative would impact sensitive plants, sensitive animals, sensitive vegetation communities, wetland and local policies, ordinances and habitat conservation plans due to vegetation removal associated with construction activities. Because the Development Configuration Alternative would have the same biological resources impacts as the proposed project and would implement the same mitigation measures, this alternative would result in a similar contribution to the significant cumulative impact, and would not be cumulatively considerable.

Cultural Resources

Although this alternative would result in significantly less ground disturbance due to reduced grading, development would occur on the same project site and similar ground disturbing activities related to construction would occur. Therefore, when compared to the proposed project, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in similar significant impacts to cultural resources, including historical resources, archaeological resources and paleontological resources. These impacts would be mitigable to a level of less than significant level with implementation of measures Cul-2A, Cul-4A, Cul-4B, and Cul-4C. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would result in a less than significant impact to human remains.

Similar to the proposed project, after mitigation the Development Configuration Alternative cultural resources impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

Geology and Soils

Although the Development Configuration Alternative would result in less ground disturbance than the proposed project, this alternative would occur on the same geologic site as the proposed project and similar construction techniques, such as grading, foundation construction and retaining wall construction, would be required. Therefore, this alternative would result in similar significant impacts to seismic-related hazards, soil erosion and topsoil loss, soil and slope instability and expansive soils as the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures Geo-1A, Geo-2A, Geo-3A, Geo-3B and Geo-4A would reduce geology and soil impacts under the Development Configuration Alternative to a level below significant.

As evaluated in Section 4.5.4 (Geology and Soils) in the EIR, a significant cumulative impact related to seismic-related hazards exists. Because this alternative occurs on the same geologic site as the proposed project, would have similar construction techniques as the proposed project, and would implement the same mitigation measures, the Development Configuration Alternative cumulative impact would be the same as the proposed project, which is not cumulatively considerable after implementation of mitigation.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

When compared to the proposed project, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in lesser GHG emissions and hazards related to climate change because this alternative would involve substantially less grading and would require substantially less use of heavy construction equipment during site preparation and grading activities. Operational emissions under this alternative would be the same as the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in a less than significant impact related to GHG emissions and conflicts with adopted plans. Although the Development Configuration Alternative would result in less GHG emissions than the proposed project, the construction and operational emissions associated with this alternative would result in a significant climate change hazards impact. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of applicable mitigation measures in other sections of this EIR would reduce this impact to a level below significant.

As discussed in Section 4.6.4 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) in this EIR, due to the nature of assessment of GHG emissions and the effects of climate change, impacts can currently only be analyzed from a cumulative context. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to GHG emissions and conflicts with applicable plans would be less than significant and would not result in a cumulative contribution. With implementation of applicable mitigation measures in other sections of this EIR, impacts related to climate change hazards would be reduced to a level below significant and a cumulative contribution would not occur.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Development Configuration Alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts as the proposed project with regard to hazardous materials because similar quantities and types of materials would be used under either scenario. This alternative would require the same emergency access routes as the proposed project and would result in the same significant emergency access impact. Implementation of mitigation measure Tra-3A would reduce this impact to a level below significant. However, similar to the proposed project, if this mitigation measure is found to be infeasible then the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Also similar to the proposed project, the Development Configuration Alternative would place structures and people in a location at risk of wildfire. Implementation of mitigation measure Haz-3A would reduce this impact to a level below significant.

As evaluated in Section 4.6.4 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) in this EIR, cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials, emergency response plans and wildlife fire hazards are less than significant. Because this alternative would have the same impacts as the proposed project in terms of hazardous materials, emergency response plans and wildland fires, it would result in a similar, not cumulatively considerable contribution.

Hydrology and Water Quality

As described in Section 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality), the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to drainage alteration, erosion and siltation, groundwater supply and recharge, surface water quality and flood hazards. Similar to the proposed, the Alternative Development Configuration would construct an on-site drainage system that would result in less than significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality. When compared to the proposed project,

this alternative would result in similar amounts of impermeable space as the proposed project, because the similar amounts of homes, rooftops and roadways would be constructed. Therefore, the Development Configuration Alternative would be expected to contribute the same quantity of runoff pollutants as the proposed project. When compared to the proposed project, this alternative would result in less erosion and siltation due to the significant reduction in grading.

As evaluated in Section 4.8.4 (Hydrology and Water Quality) in this EIR, significant cumulative impacts related to drainage alteration, erosion and siltation, surface water quality and flood hazards exist. Similar to the proposed project, the Alternative Development Configuration would result in less than significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality. Therefore, the Development Configuration Alternative would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

Land Use and Planning

The Development Configuration Alternative would require amendments to the San Dimas General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25 related to density. Similar to the proposed project, upon approval of these amendments, no conflicts with applicable land use plans or policies would occur and this alternative would result in a less than significant impact. As evaluated in Section 4.9.4 (Land Use) in this EIR, cumulative impacts related to land use plans and incompatibilities between adjacent land uses are less than significant.

Public Services

Because the residential population under the Development Configuration Alternative would be similar to that of the proposed project, demand on public services, including fire, police, schools, and parks and trail facilities would be the same. Therefore, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to fire, police and schools. The Development Configuration Alternative would also include the construction of a trail, and would therefore result in the same significant park and trail impacts as the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures Pub-4A, Pub-4B, and applicable mitigation measures in the other sections of this EIR would reduce impacts related to parks and trails from the Development Configuration Alternative to a level below significance.

As evaluated in Section 4.10.4 (Public Services) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to fire protection, police services, public schools and recreational facilities are considered less than significant. With implementation of mitigation measures Pub-4A, Pub-4B, and applicable mitigation measures in the other sections of this EIR, the cumulative impact for the Development Configuration Alternative would be reduced to a level below significance.

Transportation and Traffic

The Alternative Development Configuration would have the same circulation system as the proposed project and would result in the same number of vehicle trips generated to and from the project site. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would result in significant impacts related to transportation hazards and emergency access and the same less than significant impacts related to increases in traffic and alternative transportation policies. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of mitigation measures Tra-2A and Tra-2B and Tra-3A would reduce significant impacts related to transportation hazards to a level below significant.

Similar to the proposed project, the Development Configuration Alternative would not improve the off-site roadways that would provide emergency access to the site. These routes do not meet City and LACoFD standards and, similar to the proposed project, this would be considered a significant impact. Implementation of Tra-3A would reduce this impact to a level below significant. However, if mitigation measure Tra-3A is found to be infeasible, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Similar to the proposed project, the Development Configuration Alternative would construct a trail and would have similar less than significant impacts related to alternative transportation plans and policies.

As evaluated in Section 4.13.4 (Transportation and Traffic), cumulative impacts related to traffic increases, transportation hazards, emergency access and alternative transportation plans and policies are less than significant. With implementation of mitigation measures Tra-2A, Tra-2B and Tra-3A, the cumulative contributions from the Alternative Development Configuration would not be cumulatively considerable.

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy

The residential population under the Development Configuration Alternative would be the same as that of the proposed project and demand for wastewater treatment, new water or wastewater facilities, new storm water facilities, water supply availability, landfill capacity and energy consumption would be the same as the proposed project. Therefore, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in the same less than significant impacts for wastewater treatment, water supply availability and landfill capacity. Similar to the proposed project, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in significant impacts related to new stormwater, new water, new wastewater and new energy facilities. Implementation of applicable mitigation measures in other sections of this EIR would reduce impacts related to the construction of these utilities to a level below significance.

As evaluated in Section 4.12.4 (Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to wastewater treatment, new water or wastewater facilities, new storm water facilities, water supply availability, and landfill capacity are less than significant. However, cumulative impacts to energy consumption are significant. Because the Alternative Development Configuration would result in the same demand as the proposed project, this alternative's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be considered cumulatively considerable.

Ability to Accomplish Project Objectives

The Development Configuration Alternative would meet all of the proposed project's objectives because the site plan would be essentially the same as the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, Objective one, two and three would be met because this alternative would also require amendments to the San Dimas General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25. Objective four would be met by this alternative because it would occur on the same project site, which is located within a "Development Feasibility Area," as identified by General Plan Exhibit II-5.2. Objective five and six would be met because, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would place development in areas to reduce visual impacts and consolidate and increase open space. The Development Configuration Alternative would require the same Fuel Management Plan as the proposed project, which would meet objective seven by enhancing fire protection in the Northern Foothills. This alternative would also meet project objective eight because development would be coordinated with the provision of infrastructure.

6.2.4 Improved Emergency Access Alternative

The Improved Emergency Access Alternative would have the same development footprint as the proposed project but would include improved on and off-site emergency access routes. Under this alternative, up to four secondary emergency access routes (see Figure 3-1, Proposed Project Site) would be provided along the eastern and western boundaries of the project site and would be improved to applicable LACoFD and/or City standards. The secondary emergency access routes would utilize the existing fire roads and motorways that currently traverse the project site and surrounding areas. All on-site project roadways would be constructed to withstand all weather conditions and be a minimum of 24-feet in width to accommodate emergency access personal. Existing off-site roads and motorways that would provide secondary access to the project site would also undergo improvements to meet Los Angeles County Fire Department standards. The improvement of these off-site roadways would prevent a potential hazard associated with large scale evacuation from an event such as a wildfire but would result in a greater total disturbance footprint than the proposed project. The construction and improvement of the Improved Emergency Access Alternative's emergency access routes would potentially require approval from the City of Glendora and the County of Los Angeles. Emergency Access routes would not be open to the public.

Similar to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would provide public services and utilities, including fire protection services, police protection services, public schools services, water infrastructure, wastewater infrastructure, stormwater infrastructure, a Fuel Modification Plan and an equestrian trail. The Improved Emergency Access Alternative would also require amendments to the General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25 and approval from public service providers.

Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

The Improved Emergency Access Alternative would substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site and surroundings by introducing residential development and infrastructure onto hillsides and ridgelines. When compared to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result the same significant visual character and quality and lighting and glare impacts because the development footprint would be the same as the proposed project. This alternative would also result in the same impacts to scenic vistas as the proposed project, which is less than significant. Similar to the proposed project, impacts would to lighting and glare would be mitigated by implementing measures Aes-3A through Aes-3E. Also similar to the proposed project, even with implementation of mitigation measure Aes-1A, impacts to visual character and quality would remain significant and unavoidable.

As evaluated in Section 4.1.4 (Aesthetics) of this EIR, a significant cumulative impact exists within the geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts in regards to visual character and quality, scenic vistas and light and glare. This level of impact would remain the same under the Improved Emergency Access Alternative. For the same reasons given in Section 4.1.4 for the proposed project, the contribution of the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would not be cumulatively considerable to scenic vistas and light and glare with implementation of mitigation measures. The Emergency Access Alternative would result in a significantly cumulative contribution to visual character and quality.

Air Quality

Compared to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in a slight increase in the production of air emissions during construction, due to an increase in construction operations that would occur during off-site emergency access roadway improvements. After construction, the Development Configuration Alternative would result in the same operational emissions as the proposed project because the same number of residences would be constructed. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to ambient air quality standards and sensitive receptors would remain significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of mitigation measures AQ-2A and AQ-2B. Although this alternative would result in slightly more construction related emissions than the proposed project, the increase would be minimal and temporary in nature, and impacts related to consistency with regional plans and objectionable odors would be less than significant.

As evaluated in Section 4.2.4 (Air Quality) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to ambient air quality standards and sensitive receptors would be significant, while cumulative impacts to regional air quality plans and objectionable odors would be less than significant. The Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in a slight increase in construction air emissions when compared to the proposed project and it would result in the same significant and unavoidable impacts to ambient air quality standards and sensitive receptors as the proposed project, even with implementation of AQ-2A and AQ-2B. Therefore, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to air quality impacts.

Biological Resources

The Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in significant impacts related to sensitive plants, sensitive animals, sensitive vegetative communities, wetlands and local polices and ordinances due to vegetation clearing that would be required during the construction stage. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would result in a less than significant impact to wildlife corridors. Compared to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in more impacts to biological resources because additional biological disturbance would occur during off-site emergency access route improvements. Although impacts to biological resources would be greater under this alternative, significant impacts to biological resources would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of measures: Bio-1A, Bio-1B, Bio-1C, bio-1D, Bio-1E, Bio-1F, Bio-2A, Bio-2B, Bio-3A, Bio-3B, Bio-4A, Bio-4B, Bio-4C, Bio-4D, Bio-4E, and Bio-6A.

As evaluated in Section 4.3.4 (Biological Resources) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities, wetlands, and wildlife movement corridors are significant. Cumulative impacts related to local policies, ordinances and habitat conservation plans would be less than significant. When compared to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would impact more sensitive plants, sensitive animals, sensitive vegetative communities, wetland and local policies, ordinances and habitat conservation plans due to additional vegetation removal associated with off-site emergency access roadway construction and improvement activities. However, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would implement the same mitigation measures as the proposed project, which would reduce biological resources impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would not result in cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact.

Cultural Resources

Ground disturbance associated with the construction of the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in significant impacts to historical resources, archaeological resources and paleontological resources. When compared to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in greater impacts to cultural resources because more ground disturbance would occur from the off-site construction of emergency access routes. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would result in a less than significant impact to human remains. Impacts to historical resources, archaeological resources and paleontological resources from the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would be mitigable to a less than significant level with measures Cul-2A, Cul-4A, Cul-4B, and Cul-4C.

Although additional ground disturbance would occur under the Improved Emergency Access Alternative, similar to the proposed project, after mitigation the Improved Emergency Access Alternative cultural resources impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

Geology and Soils

Although the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in greater construction and ground disturbance than the proposed project, impacts related to geology and soils would be similar to the proposed project because development would occur on the essentially same geologic site and similar construction techniques, such as grading, foundation construction and retaining wall construction, would be required. Therefore, impacts related to seismic-related hazards, soil erosion and topsoil loss, soil and slope instability and expansive soils for the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would be the same as the proposed project, significant. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of mitigation measures Geo-1A, Geo-2A, Geo-3A, Geo-3B and Geo-4A would reduce geology and soil impacts to a level below significant.

As evaluated in Section 4.5.4 (Geology and Soils) in the EIR, a significant cumulative impact related to seismic-related hazards exists. Because this alternative occurs on the same geologic site as the proposed project, would have similar construction techniques as the proposed project, and would implement the same mitigation measures, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would also not have a cumulatively considerable impact.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

When compared to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in additional GHG emissions and climate change related hazards because this alternative would involve additional use of heavy construction equipment during construction activities, which would be associated with the off-site improvements of emergency access roadways. The Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in the same operational emissions as the proposed project. Although the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in slightly more GHG emissions than the proposed project, impacts related to GHG emissions and conflicts with applicable plans would be anticipated to be at a level below significant. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative's construction and operational GHG emissions would result in a significant impact to climate change hazards. Implementation of applicable mitigation measures in other sections of this EIR would reduce this impact to a level below significant.

As discussed in Section 4.6.4 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) in this EIR, due to the nature of assessment of GHG emissions and the effects of climate change, impacts can currently only be analyzed from a cumulative context. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to GHG emissions and conflicts with applicable plans would be less than significant and would not result in a cumulative contribution. With implementation of applicable mitigation measures in other sections of this EIR, impacts related to climate change hazards would be reduced to a level below significant and a cumulative contribution would not occur.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Compared to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts with regard to hazardous materials because similar types of materials would be anticipated under either scenario. Also similar to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would place structures and people in a location at risk of wildfire which is considered a significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure Haz-3A would reduce this wildfire impact to a level below significant. When compared to the proposed project the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in fewer impacts related to emergency response plans and emergency access routes because off-site emergency access routes would be improved to meet fire standards. Improvement of the off-site emergency access routes would result in less than significant impacts, unlike the proposed project which would result in a significant impact that would be mitigated with implementation of measure Tra-3A.

As evaluated in Section 4.6.4 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) in this EIR, cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials, emergency response plans and wildfire fire hazards are less than significant. Because this alternative would have the same impacts in terms of hazardous materials and wildland fires, it would result in a similar contribution that is not cumulatively considerable. In terms of emergency access, this alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution.

Hydrology and Water Quality

As described in Section 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality), the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to drainage alteration, erosion and siltation, groundwater supply and recharge, surface water quality and flood hazards. Similar to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would construct an on-site drainage system that would result in less than significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality. When compared to the proposed project, this alternative would result in increased impermeable surface, due to additional paving of off-site emergency access routes. Additional impermeable surfaces would increase the quantity of pollutants that could enter surface or groundwater from project runoff; however compliance with existing regulations would maintain this impact at a level below significance.

As evaluated in Section 4.8.4 (Hydrology and Water Quality) in this EIR, significant cumulative impacts related to drainage alteration, erosion and siltation, surface water quality and flood hazards exist. Similar to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would not be cumulatively considerable.

Land Use and Planning

The Improved Emergency Access Alternative would require amendments to the San Dimas General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25. Further, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would be required to comply with applicable plans and policies of the County of Los Angeles and the City of Glendora, which may require additional amendments to relevant planning documents. Similar to the proposed project, upon approval of these amendments, no conflicts with applicable land use plans or policies would occur and this alternative would result in a less than significant impact. As evaluated in Section 4.9.4 (Land Use) in this EIR, cumulative impacts related to land use plans and incompatibilities between adjacent land uses are less than significant.

Public Services

Because the residential population under the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would be the same as the proposed project, demand on public services, including fire, police, schools, and parks and trail facilities would be the same. Therefore, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to fire, police and schools. The Improved Emergency Access would also include the construction of a trail, and would therefore result in the same significant park and trail impacts as the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures Pub-4A, Pub-4B and applicable mitigation measures in the other sections of this EIR would reduce impacts related to parks and trails from the Improved Emergency Access to a level below significance.

As evaluated in Section 4.10.4 (Public Services) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to fire protection, police services, public schools and recreational facilities are considered less than significant. With implementation of mitigation measures Pub-4A, Pub-4B and applicable mitigation measures in the other sections of this EIR, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative cumulative impact would be reduced to a level below significance.

Transportation and Traffic

The Improved Emergency Access Alternative would have the same public circulation system as the proposed project and would result in the same number of vehicle trips generated to and from the project site. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would result in significant impacts related to transportation hazards and the same less than significant impacts related to increases in traffic and alternative transportation policies. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of mitigation measures Tra-2A and Tra-2B would reduce significant impacts related to transportation hazards to a level below significant. Unlike the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would improve off-site emergency access roadways to meet fire standards and would result in a less than significant impact. Therefore, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would provide better emergency access than the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would construct a trail and would have similar less than significant impacts related to alternative transportation plans and policies.

As evaluated in Section 4.13.4 (Transportation and Traffic), cumulative impacts related to traffic increases, transportation hazards, emergency access and alternative transportation plans and policies are less than significant. With implementation of mitigation measures Tra-2A, Tra-2B and Tra-3A, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to inadequate emergency access.

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy

The residential population under the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would be the same as that of the proposed project and demand for wastewater treatment, new water or wastewater facilities, new storm water facilities, water supply availability, landfill capacity and energy consumption would be the same as the proposed project. Therefore, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in the same less than significant impacts for wastewater treatment, water supply availability and landfill capacity. Similar to the proposed project, the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in significant impacts related to new stormwater, new water, new wastewater and new energy facilities. Implementation of applicable mitigation measures in other sections of this EIR would reduce impacts related to the construction of these utilities to a level below significance.

As evaluated in Section 4.12.4 (Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy) in this EIR, cumulative impacts to wastewater treatment, new water or wastewater facilities, new storm water facilities, water supply availability, and landfill capacity are less than significant. However, cumulative impacts to energy consumption are significant. Because the Improved Emergency Access Alternative would result in the same demand as the proposed project, this alternative's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be considered cumulatively considerable.

Ability to Accomplish Project Objectives

The Improved Emergency Access Alternative would be consistent with all of the project objectives. Objective one, two and three would be met because this alternative would require the same amendments to the San Dimas General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25 as the proposed project, which would establish residential density and development standards, among other things, for the project site. Objective four would be met by this alternative because it would occur on the same project site as the proposed project, which is located within a "Development Feasibility Areas," as identified by General Plan Exhibit II-5.2. Objective five and six would be met because this alternative places residences in less visually obtrusive areas and clusters development to maximize open space. Objectives seven and eight would be met by the Improved Emergency Access Alternative because emergency access routes would be improved off-site, which would improve emergency access in the region while providing public improvements to accommodate new development.

6.2.5 Alternatives Summary

Table 6-1 provides a summary comparison based on the discussion above of the significant direct impacts that would result from the proposed project and the impacts that would result from each of the analyzed alternatives in relation to the proposed project.

6.2.6 Alternatives Ability to Meet Project Objectives Summary

Table 6-2, below, provides a summary of the selected alternatives' abilities to meet the proposed project objectives.

Table 6-1 Summary of Analysis for Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Proposed Project	Alternatives to the Proposed Project					
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	No Project	Reduced Project (38 lots)	Alternative Development Configuration	Improved Emergency Access
Issue Areas with Potential for Significant Impacts under the proposed project or its Alternatives						
4.1 Aesthetics						
Visual Character and Quality	S	SU	▼	▲	▼	—
Scenic Vistas	LS	LS	▼	▲	▼	—
Lighting and Glare	S	LS	▼	▼	—	—
4.2 Air Quality						
Consistency with Regional Plans	LS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Ambient Air Quality Standards	S	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Sensitive Receptors	S	SU	▼	▼	▼	▲
Objectionable Odors	LS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
4.3 Biological Resources						
Special Status Plant Species	S	LS	▼	—	—	▲
Special Status Wildlife Species	S	LS	▼	—	—	▲
Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Communities	S	LS	▼	—	—	▲
Wetlands	S	LS	▼	—	—	▲
Wildlife Movement Corridors	LS	LS	▼	—	—	—
Local Policies or Ordinances	S	LS	▼	—	—	▲
4.4 Cultural Resources						
Historical Resources	S	LS	▼	—	—	▲
Archaeological Resources	S	LS	▼	—	—	▲
Human Remains	LS	LS	▼	—	—	▲
Paleontological Resources	S	LS	▼	—	—	▲
4.5 Geology and Soils						
Exposure to Seismic-related Hazards	S	LS	▼	—	—	—
Soil Erosion or Topsoil Loss	S	LS	▼	—	—	—
Soil and Slope Instability	S	LS	▼	—	—	—
Expansive Soils	S	LS	▼	—	—	—
4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions						
GHG Emissions and Conflict with Adopted Plans	LS	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲
Hazards related to Climate Change	S	LS	▼	▼	▼	▲

Proposed Project	Alternatives to the Proposed Project					
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	No Project	Reduced Project (38 lots)	Alternative Development Configuration	Improved Emergency Access
Issue Areas with Potential for Significant Impacts under the proposed project or its Alternatives						
4.7 Hazardous Materials						
Hazardous Materials	LS	LS	▼	—	—	—
Emergency Response Plans and Routes	S	LS*	▼	—	—	▼
Wildland Fire Hazards	S	LS	▼	—	—	—
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality						
Drainage Alteration, Erosion and Siltation	LS	LS	▼	—	▼	—
Groundwater Supply and Recharge	LS	LS	▼	—	—	—
Surface Water Quality	LS	LS	▼	▼	—	▲
Flood Hazards	LS	LS	▼	—	—	—
4.9 Land Use						
Conflict with Land Use Plans	LS	LS	▼	—	—	—
4.10 Public Services						
Fire Protection	LS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Police Protection	LS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Public Schools	LS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Parks and Trails	S	LS	▼	▼	—	—
4.11 Transportation and Traffic						
Increases in Traffic	LS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Transportation Hazards	S	LS	▼	—	—	—
Emergency Access	S	LS*	▼	—	—	▼
Alternative Transportation Plans, Policies, and Programs	LS	LS	▼	—	—	—
4.12 Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy						
Wastewater Treatment	LS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
New Water or Wastewater Facilities	S	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Impacts from New Stormwater Facilities	S	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Water Supply Availability	LS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Landfill Capacity	LS	LS	▼	▼	—	—
Energy	S	LS	▼	▼	—	—

▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to proposed project

— Alternative is likely to result in a similar impacts to issue when compared to proposed project

▼ Alternative is likely to result in less impacts to issue when compared to proposed project

S Significant Impact

LS Less Than Significant Impact

SU Significant and Unavoidable Impact

* Project impacts related to emergency access would be reduced to a level below significant with implementation of mitigation measure Tra-3A. However, if mitigation measure Tra-3A is found to be infeasible, emergency access impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table 6-2 Ability of Project Alternatives to Meet Proposed Project Objectives

Proposed Project Objectives	Ability of Alternatives to Meet the Proposed Project Objectives				
	Proposed Project	No Project	Reduced Project (38 lots)	Development Configuration	Improved Emergency Access
1. To implement the Settlement Agreement by amending the San Dimas General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25 to modify residential densities, development standards, land use goals and policies, and other provisions.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. To adopt amendments to the General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25 that are sensitive to the unique character of the Northern Foothills, particularly with respect to visual, open space and biological resources, while meeting the parties obligations under the Settlement Agreement.	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
3. To establish residential density and development standards (including two-story structures) that permit the construction of a single-family residential project that also provides the possibility for amenities to the community in the form of multi-use trails, connective trail access to adjacent properties and open space for habitat conservation and/or recreational uses.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
4. To focus residential densities predominantly in areas that the General Plan and Specific Plan have identified as "Development Feasibility Areas" (see General Plan Exhibit II-5.2) or which meet the standards set forth for DFA's and are also in the closest proximity to existing development and infrastructure.	Yes	No	Partial	Yes	Yes
5. To focus development, residential access roads, grading and residential lot locations into areas that are less visually intrusive than may have otherwise occurred under the "San Dimas Concept Lotting Plan" that is part of the Settlement Agreement.	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
6. To consolidate and increase opportunities for open space on the project site by allowing clustered development, two-story structures, and smaller lot sizes and identifying "no build areas" on residential lots.	Yes	No	Partial	Yes	Yes
7. To enhance the fire protection in the Northern Foothills through development of new water systems, water storage tanks, fire hydrants, paved public and private accesses, brush clearances, turnouts, turnarounds, improved emergency access points, fuel modification zones, debris removal and maintenance.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
8. To accommodate new development that is coordinated with the provision of infrastructure and public improvements.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

6.3 Environmentally Superior Alternative

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative, the alternative having the potential for the fewest significant environmental impacts, from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. Table 6-1 provides a summary comparison of the alternatives with the proposed project with the purpose of highlighting whether the alternative would result in a similar, greater, or lesser impact, than the proposed project. The No Project (No Build) Alternative would avoid all significant environmental impacts of the development under the proposed project. The absence of development under this alternative would reduce impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, public services, transportation and traffic and utilities, service systems and energy. However, while the No Project Alternative would minimize impacts to environmental resources, it would not meet any of the project objectives.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) (2) requires that an EIR shall identify another alternative among the other alternatives as environmentally superior if the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative. The Development Configuration Alternative scenario is identified as environmentally superior between the three alternatives which are not “no project” alternatives. The Development Configuration Alternative significantly reduces the amount of grading that would be required to develop the project site, which would reduce environmental impacts related to the following: aesthetics, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and hydrology and water quality. However, the remaining environmental impacts would be the same as the proposed project.

The Development Configuration Alternative would meet all of the proposed project’s objectives because the site plan would be essentially the same as the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, Objective one, two and three would be met because this alternative would also require amendments to the San Dimas General Plan and Specific Plan No. 25. Objective four would be met by this alternative because it would occur on the same project site, which is located within a “Development Feasibility Area,” as identified by General Plan Exhibit II-5.2. Objective five and six would be met because, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would place development in areas to reduce visual impacts and consolidate and increase open space. The Development Configuration Alternative would require the same Fuel Management Plan as the proposed project, which would meet objective seven by enhancing fire protection in the Northern Foothills. This alternative would also meet project objective eight because development would be coordinated with the provision of infrastructure.

This page intentionally left blank.