

5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1 Overview

CEQA requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to a proposed project, or to the location of a proposed project, that could feasibly attain the basic project objectives. The EIR must also evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. This chapter sets forth and evaluates potential alternatives to the proposed project, as required by CEQA.

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

- *The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.*
- *The No Project Alternative shall be evaluated along with its impact. The No Project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved.*
- *The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.*
- *Factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, General Plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site.*
- *For alternative locations, only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.*
- *An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.*

In identifying alternatives for this EIR, the Lead Agency selected those that comply with CEQA requirements and would otherwise be reasonable and feasible for the project site, in consideration of the characteristics of the area and public comments received during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) comment period and at the public scoping meeting on January 10, 2006.

5.1.2 Alternatives Discussion

Section 21100 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15126 of the CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to identify and discuss a No Project Alternative and a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts. Alternatives to the proposed project that are being considered for analysis in this EIR are outlined below.

- **No Project/No Build:** This alternative would involve no changes to the existing land uses within the project area.
- **No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning:** This alternative would involve no changes to the existing General Plan or Zoning Code and would analyze build-out consistent with the existing General Plan and zoning designations.
- **Residential in District 2:** The Residential in District 2 Alternative would provide for a mixed-use development within District 2. Residential density within the District would be consistent with the existing Mixed-Use Overlay (22 dwelling units per acre [du/ac]).
- **Residential West of Dry Bank Drive:** The Residential West of Dry Bank Drive Alternative provides for mixed-use development west of Dry Bank Drive on property currently occupied by the Avenue and Peninsula Center shopping centers. Maximum allowable residential development within these areas would be consistent with the existing Mixed-Use Overlay (22 du/ac).
- **Reduced Project Alternative:** The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the allowable residential and commercial by 20 percent in order to minimize or avoid the significant project and cumulative traffic impacts associated with the proposed project. This alternative would allow a maximum number of 720 residential units, excluding District 2, and a maximum commercial development of 2,247,481 square feet (sf) throughout the project area. Residential uses would be permitted throughout the entire project area, not limited to the area between Dry Bank Drive and Crenshaw Boulevard.

For each alternative, the analysis provides the following:

- A description of the alternative
- The impacts of the alternative and significance of those impacts (per the CEQA Guidelines, significant effects of an alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed)
- A comparison of the alternative relative to the proposed project, specifically addressing project objectives, feasibility, the elimination or reduction of impacts, and comparative environmental merits

5.1.3 Alternatives Withdrawn From Further Consideration

There were no alternatives previously identified by the City that have been determined infeasible.

5.2 PROPOSED PROJECT

A summary of the proposed project and the project objectives are provided in Chapter 3.0 of this EIR, which can be used for reference in evaluating the comparative merits of the alternatives. For a detailed discussion of the proposed project's impacts, refer to Chapter 4.0, Existing Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.

5.2.1 Project Description

Refer to Chapter 3.0, Project Description, for a detailed description of the project characteristics and other actions required as part of the project implementation.

5.2.2 Project Objectives

Each alternative is analyzed to determine whether it achieves the objectives of the proposed project. The project objectives listed in Chapter 3.5 are repeated below and numbered for reference in this chapter.

1. Provide for the orderly development of a mixed-use village in the City's main commercial area.
2. Encourage a range of housing opportunities in conjunction with existing and future commercial/office uses at a density that fosters pedestrian movement.
3. Preserve regional shopping opportunities to meet the needs of the community.

5.2.3 Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project

The following discussion provides analysis of alternatives to the proposed project, including comparison of the environmental effects of each alternative with those of the proposed project. Table 5.M provides a summary of the alternatives analysis.

The significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project include:

- cumulative construction air quality impacts,
- long-term operational air quality effects due to vehicle emissions,
- cumulative long-term air quality impacts,
- project traffic impacts at the Hawthorne Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) intersection, and
- cumulative traffic impacts at the Hawthorne Boulevard/PCH intersection.

The proposed project and the alternatives addressed in this EIR would not have a significant impact on aesthetics, biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services and utilities (except library services), or recreation and open space.

5.3 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT/NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE

5.3.1 Description

Consistent with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project/No Build Alternative is the existing condition of the project site at the time the NOP was published. The setting of the site at the time of the NOP is described throughout Chapter 4.0 of this Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) with respect to individual environmental issues, and it forms the baseline of the impact assessment of the proposed project. This alternative represents the environmental conditions that would exist if no change in existing land uses were to occur.

The No Project/No Build Alternative anticipates that the current conditions on site would not change. The project site is currently developed as the City's main commercial area (Peninsula Center) with approximately 2,134,878 sf of commercial area. Peninsula Center includes the Peninsula Shopping Center, the Shops at Palos Verdes, The Village, Town and Country shopping center, and a number of other commercial uses. Public uses within the project area include the United States Postal Services and the City of Rolling Hills Estates Library.

5.3.2 Attainment of Project Objectives

The No Project/No Build Alternative would not be consistent with Project Objective One or Two. This alternative would not provide for the orderly development of a mixed-use village in the City's main commercial area as allowed in the General Plan. Although regional shopping opportunities meeting the needs of the community would be preserved, a range of housing opportunities in conjunction with existing and future commercial/office uses at a density that fosters pedestrian movement would not be encouraged.

5.3.3 Comparison of Impacts

The No Project/No Build Alternative assumes that the existing conditions on site would remain unchanged. No additional vehicle trips would be generated by the site with the No Project/No Build Alternative. For comparison purposes, the proposed project would generate an average of 64,042 daily trips. The No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative (Alternative 2) would generate 113,395 daily trips, the Residential in District 2 Alternative (Alternative 3) would generate the same number of daily trips as the proposed project (64,042), and the Residential West of Dry Bank Drive Alternative (Alternative 4) would also generate the same number of daily trips as the proposed project. See Section 4.13 of this PEIR for more information regarding the traffic impacts of the proposed project. The existing intersection operations associated with the No Project/No Build Alternative would be identical to the existing setting intersection operations discussed in Section 4.13, Traffic and Transportation. As presented in Section 4.13, 5 of the 18 local existing intersections operate with a level of service (LOS) D or worse in either the a.m. or p.m. peak hours for the existing setting (No Project/No Build Alternative). Based on the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP) significance criteria, two of the six CMP intersections of State facilities operate at LOS F in one or both peak hours for the existing setting (No Project/No Build Alternative). Although the intersections below would operate with unsatisfactory levels of service, no significant

traffic impacts are forecast to occur as a result of the No Project/No Build Alternative because no additional development would occur on site.

- Crenshaw Boulevard/Silver Spur Road (LOS E during the p.m. peak hour)
- Silver Spur Road/Hawthorne Boulevard (LOS D during the a.m. peak hour)
- Silver Spur Road/Palos Verdes Drive North (LOS F during the a.m. peak hour)
- Hawthorne Boulevard/Palos Verde Drive North (LOS E in the a.m. peak hour)
- Rolling Hills Road/Palos Verdes Drive North (LOS D in the a.m. peak hour)
- Western Avenue (SR-213)/Palos Verdes Drive North (LOS F in the a.m. peak hour)
- Interstate 110 northbound ramps/Pacific Coast Highway (SR-1) (LOS F in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours)

No new air pollutant emissions would be generated by short-term construction emissions since no new construction is proposed. No short-term construction noise impacts or long-term operational noise impacts would occur to the surrounding area. The existing vegetation and wildlife on site would not be further disturbed compared with existing conditions. Existing views of and from the site would not be altered. Unknown potential subsurface archaeological and paleontological resources would remain undisturbed. No new impacts to library services would be created by this alternative.

This alternative would avoid the project's significant effects related to construction air quality and impact on library services.

5.3.4 Summary for Alternative 1

The No Project/No Build Alternative would avoid the project-related significant effects as a result of construction air quality emissions since this alternative would not involve any grading or use of construction equipment on site. The No Project/No Build Alternative would avoid the project-related significant effects as a result of traffic and operational air emissions since no new vehicular trips or other operational sources would be generated as a result of this alternative. This alternative would also avoid the impact to library services since there would be no new residential or commercial uses in the project area. However, this alternative would not meet project objectives one or two.

5.4 ALTERNATIVE 2: NO PROJECT/GENERAL PLAN/EXISTING ZONING ALTERNATIVE

5.4.1 Description

The No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative considers the development of the project site under the existing Mixed-Use Overlay General Plan designation. The project area would continue to allow mixed-use development over the entire project area from Crenshaw Boulevard to Hawthorne Boulevard. The maximum density would remain 22 du/ac throughout the project area and would continue to require at least 300 sf of usable open space per dwelling unit.

The No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would allow for the build out of the current General Plan. As shown in Table 5.A, the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would continue to allow a maximum of 2,020 du and a maximum commercial development of 5,044,519 sf within the 91.82-acre project area.

Table 5.A: Maximum Development within the Project Area under the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative

	No Project/General Plan/ Existing Zoning Alternative: Existing General Plan/Zoning	Proposed General Plan/Zoning (Commercial General/Peninsula Village Overlay Zone)
Project Area	91.82 acres	91.82 acres
Area Allowing Residential Uses	91.82 acres	34.21 acres
Maximum Residential Units	2,020 du	900 du ¹
Maximum Commercial Development	Approximately 5,044,519 sf ²	Approximately 2,318,141 sf ³

Under this alternative, the project area would remain General Plan designated Commercial General allowing residential densities up to 22 du/ac. The Hazards Management Overlay, Mixed-Use Development Overlay, Scenic Corridor Overlay, Ecological Overlay, and Cultural Resources Overlay Zones would continue to be applicable to the project area.

5.4.2 Attainment of Project Objectives

The No Project/ General Plan Alternative would meet all of the project objectives. First, a mixed-use village in the City’s main commercial area would be developed throughout the 91.82 acre project area. Next, housing opportunities would be limited to a maximum of 22 du/acre throughout the project area. This maximum allowable density would limit the range of housing opportunities near existing and future commercial/office uses, which would foster pedestrian movement. And last, regional shopping opportunities meeting the needs of the community would be preserved and maintained in the City’s existing commercial core.

¹ The theoretical residential maximum for the overlay is determined by multiplying the acreage of the districts that allow residential use by the corresponding maximum proposed residential density. This calculation does not take into account other development standards such as maximum height, lot coverage, setbacks, or parking.

² Total allowable commercial square footage for the project area east of Dry Bank is 2,011,754 sf; development for the remaining allowable commercial portion of the project area west of Dry Bank is 3,032,765 sf.

³ Total allowable commercial square footage for the proposed Overlay Zone is 643,597 sf. Maximum commercial development for the remaining portion of the project area west of Dry Bank is 1,674,544 sf.

5.4.3 Comparison of Impacts

Aesthetics. The distribution of residential units within the project site would not be concentrated in the area east of Dry Bank Drive but would be allowed throughout the 91.82-acre project area. Although implementation of the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in a substantial increase in development of the project area, this alternative would not alter the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This alternative would be similar to the proposed project, although buildings heights would be lower in District, and building density would be spread over the entire project area. Development would continue in the existing character of the project area, although mixed-use development would be allowed, and development would be concentrated in the City's existing commercial core.

Air Quality. Air quality impacts, including fugitive dust and gaseous emissions, could occur during construction-related activities associated with the development of the General Plan build out. This alternative would result in increased building square footage and would require more construction activity than the proposed project. The significant impacts associated with short-term emissions from the proposed project would be primarily the result of earth movement and the use of grading equipment. The impacts of build out of the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would be a summary of individual actions undertaken throughout the project area, as opposed to an individual project with project-specific construction occurring in a single location. Therefore, it is not feasible to accurately quantify the amount of fugitive dust caused by construction that may occur at any given time. Construction impacts would actually result from a number of different development projects occurring at any given time at different locations in the planning area. Therefore, the comparable level of demolition and grading indicates that short-term emissions could be incrementally but not significantly more than the proposed project.

The No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative allows a greater number of residential units and commercial square footage than the proposed project. As shown in Section 4.13, land uses under the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would generate 113,394 daily trips on weekdays and 131,186 daily trips on weekends in 2025. Therefore, the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would generate more daily trips than the proposed project and would therefore have a greater impact on air quality than the proposed project (Table 5.B).

Biological Resources. Impacts to the following biological resources were analyzed and found to be less than significant because of their lack of presence in the project area: riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities, potential jurisdictional areas, and Rancho Palos Verdes Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) Preserve. In addition, because the project site is disturbed, located within an urban setting, and separated from any open space by roadways and development, it is not considered an integral component of any wildlife movement corridors in the area. Because the project site is also identified within the Ecological Overlay Zone, further guidelines (including field surveys and agency consultation) are set forth in the General Plan that must be followed prior to development. Therefore, impacts to these identified biological resources would be less than significant for this alternative.

Table 5.B: Operational Emissions—No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative (2025)

Source	Pollutant Emissions, lbs/day				
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀
No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative					
Weekday					
Area Sources	161	65	46	0.04	0.56
High-Rise Condominium	31	27	231	0.52	85
Quality Restaurant	26	37	294	0.65	113
Shopping Center	125	170	1,338	3.0	517
General Office Building	75	107	878	1.9	336
Total Weekday	418	406	2,787	6.11	1,052
Weekend					
Area Sources	161	65	46	0.04	0.56
High-Rise Condominium	32	28	238	0.53	88
Quality Restaurant	31	45	356	0.78	137
Shopping Center	143	200	1,577	3.5	610
General Office Building	83	121	989	2.2	379
Total Weekend	450	459	3,206	7.05	1,215
Significant impact?	Yes/Yes¹	Yes/Yes	Yes/Yes	No/No	Yes/Yes
Proposed Project					
Weekday					
Area Sources	72	29	22	0.02	0.25
High-Rise Condominium	14	13	103	0.23	38
Quality Restaurant	23	32	253	0.56	98
Shopping Center	60	84	666	1.5	258
General Office Building	44	65	534	1.2	204
Total Weekday	213	223	1,578	3.51	598
Weekend					
Area Sources	72	29	22	0.02	0.25
High-Rise Condominium	14	14	106	0.24	39
Quality Restaurant	27	39	311	0.69	120
Shopping Center	71	102	808	1.8	312
General Office Building	51	76	626	1.4	240
Total Weekend	235	260	1,873	4.15	711
Significant impact?	Yes/Yes	Yes/Yes	Yes/Yes	No/No	Yes/Yes
SCAQMD threshold	55	55	550	150	150

ROG = reactive organic gas CO = carbon monoxide PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than 10 microns
 NO_x = nitrogen oxide SO_x = sulfur oxide in diameter
 SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

¹ Refers to the significance of the weekday and weekend emissions, respectively.

The project was found to have a potentially significant impact to the Ecological Overlay Zone and sensitive species. The No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning would result in the same impact area as the proposed project. Therefore, the same impacts to the Ecological Overlay Zone and sensitive species is expected by this alternative.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources. No archaeological resources were identified through the records search or field survey. However, the project site may contain potentially unique unknown subsurface archeological resources that could be significantly impacted by earth-movement activities associated with the development proposed by this alternative. Since there is a potential to encounter unknown archaeological resources including human remains during excavation activities, monitoring during construction as identified in Mitigation Measures 4.4-1 and 4.4-2 would be required and would mitigate any potential impacts to less than significant.

Archival research conducted for the project area confirmed that none of the buildings within the project area are 50 years of age or older and therefore are not considered to be historic. However, as several of the buildings within the project area are approaching the 50-year threshold for significance evaluation, the evaluation of these structures as outlined in Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 would be required. Impacts to historical resources would be similar to those of the proposed project because the area for this alternative is the same as that of the proposed project.

A paleontological locality search conducted for the project site indicates that sensitive paleontological sediments that contain fossil remains may exist within the project area. Therefore, monitoring during construction as identified in Mitigation Measures 4.4-4 and 4.4-5 would be required. Impacts to paleontological resources would be similar to those of the proposed project because the area for this alternative is the same as that of the proposed project.

Geology and Soils. The project site is not located within an area of known subsidence that may be associated with groundwater or petroleum withdrawal, peat oxidation, or hydrocompaction. Thus, the potential site constraint associated with land subsidence is considered low, and no mitigation is required for either the proposed project or the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative.

The geologic analysis for the project identified several potentially significant geologic effects, including ground shaking, surface fault rupture, landslides, liquefaction, lateral spreading, erosion potential, and expansive soils. This alternative would result in greater grading and building activity on the project site and greater building mass. Therefore, it is expected that this alternative would require, at a minimum, the same mitigation measures as the proposed project. Mitigation Measures 4.5-1 to 4.5-3 would reduce the proposed project and this alternative's impacts to a level below significance.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The project site is located within the City's Hazard Management Overlay Zone due to the proximity of the project site to certain vegetation types that are susceptible to fire. The existing Mixed-Use Overlay and the proposed project would allow residential uses within a fire hazard area that do not currently exist. The proposed project or the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative, however, would not increase the fire hazards present in the project area beyond existing conditions since the project area is completely developed

with urban uses. Similar to the proposed project, there is the potential for construction activities within the project area to result in public exposure to hazardous materials from unknown sources or hazardous sites identified in Table 4.6.B (Section 4.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials). The existing Mixed-Use Overlay and the proposed project could allow residential uses within the project area that do not currently exist to impact the City's Multi-Hazard Functional Plan (MHFP) with regard to evacuation routes. Upon implementation of the proposed project or this Alternative, compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 to 4.6.3 would prevent significant hazardous impacts.

The proposed project and the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative have the potential to cause short-term interference with existing emergency response plans because construction activities within the project area could involve roadway detours and closure of existing driveways currently used for access by emergency vehicles or used as an evacuation route. Implementation of a City-approved traffic management plan for each project within the project area, to ensure that emergency vehicles will continue to have access to the project site during construction and that all evacuation routes will remain open during construction activities (Mitigation Measures 4.13-2 and 4.13-3), would reduce potential short-term emergency response or evacuation plan impacts to a less than significant level for the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative.

Hydrology and Water Quality. There is the potential for construction-related pollutants to be discharged into the City's storm drains during construction activities within the project area. Because the project area is currently built out, potential construction impacts under the proposed project and the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would be similar. Best management practices (BMPs) would be specifically identified in the project-specific Erosion Control Plan or Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) and designed to prevent erosion and construction pollutants from entering the City's storm drain and receiving waters (Mitigation Measure 4.7-1). With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7-1, potential violations of water quality standards related to runoff during future proposed project or the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative construction would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Changes in land use that could occur with implementation of the proposed project or the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative have the potential to increase the types of pollutants in runoff or increase pollutant loading to City storm drains and Machado Lake. Potential operational impacts under the proposed project and the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would be similar. Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 requires implementation of a project storm water management plan that addresses pollutants of concern, consistent with Standard Urban Storm Management Plan (SUSMP) requirements. Mitigation Measure 4.7-3 requires a mechanism to ensure ongoing maintenance of structural BMPs. Because Mitigation Measures 4.7-2 and 4.7-3 require compliance with SUSMP requirements developed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to protect water quality, the proposed project or the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would not result in a significant impact to water quality with mitigation incorporated.

Because the project area has an established storm drain system, drainage patterns under the proposed project or No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would be similar to the existing condition. In addition, because the project area is built out, significant increases in storm water runoff with implementation of the proposed project or No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative

are not anticipated. In addition, changes to regulations may result in additional drainage requirements for future development within the project area.

Any future project under the proposed project or the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would be required to prepare a drainage plan that addresses the potential for drainage-related impacts for review and approval by the City. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7-4, which requires the drainage plan to include on-site structures and/or modifications of existing drainage facilities necessary to accommodate runoff resulting from the future development, would reduce potential drainage impacts to less than significant levels.

Land Use. Under this alternative, development in the project area would comply with the existing Mixed-Use Overlay and the Commercial-General zoning codes. Maximum allowable residential density would remain 22 du/ac throughout the project area, and 300 sf of usable open space per dwelling unit would be required.

Noise. Construction-related noise is the result of site demolition, grading, and construction activities. The No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in an increase in demolition and grading greater than what is projected by the proposed project. This alternative would result in increased building square footage and would require more construction activity than the proposed project. Therefore, noise from demolition and grading would be greater than that of the proposed project. Noise from construction activity might occur for a longer period of time, since the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative results in greater building area compared with the proposed project. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance is assumed for the proposed project and for all of the build alternatives. Noise generated by construction activities between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday are exempted from the Noise Control Ordinance standards. Therefore, if construction is limited to the hours specified, noise generated during construction will not result in a significant impact for either the proposed project or the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative.

Long-term noise effects are associated with the operation of the project, including vehicular emissions and stationary source emissions. This alternative would result in more trips than the proposed project. Operational noise levels from traffic were calculated for this alternative and would be greater for this alternative than with the proposed project.

Population and Housing. The No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would allow for a maximum of 2,020 dwelling units, which could accommodate a maximum population of 3,717 persons on the project site. Compared to the proposed project, the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would increase the maximum possible number of residential units within the project area by 1,120 dwelling units. Both the proposed project and this alternative would exceed Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projections; however, this alternative would exceed SCAG projections by more than the proposed project. Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 would apply to the proposed project and the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative.

Public Services and Utilities. As stated above, the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would allow for a greater number of dwelling units and population to the project area than the proposed project. This greater population from this alternative would also result in additional demand for the existing public services and utilities in the project area. As shown in Table 5.C, this alternative would result in an estimated water demand of 542,185 gallons per day (gpd) more than the proposed project.

Table 5.C: Estimated Water Demand for the Proposed Project and Alternative 2

Land Use	Area	Consumption Factor	Estimated Water Demand (gpd)
Proposed Project			
Commercial	2,318,141 sf	0.289 gallons/sf/day	670,000
Residential	900 du	236.1 gallons/person/day ¹	564,300
Total Proposed Project			1,234,300
Alternative 2: No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative			
Commercial	5,044,519 sf	0.289 gallons/sf/day	1,457,800
Residential	2,020 du	236.1 gallons/person/day ¹	1,263,800
Total Alternative 2			2,721,600

Note: Cal Water does not use generation factors to determine the amount of water needed for a project. Therefore, generation rates from the City of Los Angeles were used.

As shown in Table 5.D, this alternative would require an estimated 43,244,102 kilowatt hours (kWh) per year more than the proposed project.

Table 5.D: Estimated Electrical Consumption for the Proposed Project and Alternative 2

Land Use	Area	Consumption Factor	Electrical Consumption (kWh/year)
Proposed Project			
Commercial	2,318,141 sf	13.55 kWh/sf/year	31,410,810
Residential	900 du	5,626.5 kWh/unit/year	5,063,850
Total Proposed Project			36,474,660
Alternative 2: No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative			
Commercial	5,044,519 sf	13.55 kWh/sf/year	68,353,232
Residential	2,020 du	5,626.5 kWh/unit/year	11,365,530
Total Alternative 2			79,718,762

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Handbook, Electric Usage Range (G), Table A9-11-A.

As shown in Table 5.E, this alternative would result in consumption of an estimated 12,399,377 cubic feet (cf) per month more natural gas than the proposed project.

¹ A density of 2.656 persons per unit was used for the California Water Service Company Water Supply Assessment.

Table 5.E: Estimated Natural Gas Consumption for the Proposed Project and Alternative 2

Land Use	Area	Consumption Factor	Natural Gas Consumption (cf/month)
Proposed Project			
Commercial	2,318,141 sf	2.9 cf/sf/month	6,722,608.9
Residential	900 du	4,011.5 cf/unit/month	3,610,350
Total Proposed Project			10,332,958
Alternative 2: No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning			
Commercial	5,044,519 sf	2.9 cf/sf/month	14,629,105
Residential	2,020 du	4,011.5 cf/unit/month	8,103,230
Total Alternative 2			22,732,335

Source: SCAQMD Natural Gas Usage Rate (G), Table A9-12-A.

As shown in Table 5.F, this alternative would generate approximately 1,139,858 gallons of wastewater per day more than the proposed project.

Table 5.F: Estimated Wastewater Generation for the Proposed Project and Alternative 2

Land Use	Area	Generation Factor ¹	Estimated Effluent Generation (gpd)
Projected Project			
Commercial	2,318,141 sf	354 gallons/1,000 sf/day ²	820,622
Residential	900 du	156 gallons/unit/day	140,400
Total Projected Project			961,022
Alternative 2: No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning			
Commercial	5,044,519 sf	354 gallons/1,000 sf/day ³	1,785,760
Residential	2,020 du	156 gallons/unit/day	315,120
Total Alternative 2			2,100,880

Source: County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County.

As shown in Table 5.G, this alternative would generate an estimated 21,876 more pounds of solid waste per day than the proposed project.

¹ Ruth I. Frazen, Engineering Technician, Finance and Property Management Section, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles. Letter dated December 19, 2005 (Appendix D).

² Sewer generation factors for commercial uses were figured by averaging the several different types of commercial uses within the existing Peninsula Village (supermarket, shopping center, regional mall, office building, professional building, and restaurant).

³ Ibid.

Table 5.G: Estimated Solid Waste Generated from the Proposed Project and Alternative 2

Land Use	Area	Generation Factor	Estimated Solid Waste Generation (lbs/day)
Proposed Project			
Commercial	2,318,141 sf	5 lbs/1,000 sf/day	11,591
Residential	1,656 persons ¹	4 lbs/resident/day	6,624
Total Proposed Project			18,215
Alternative 2: No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning			
Commercial	5,044,519 sf	5 lbs/1,000 sf/day	25,223
Residential	3,717 residents ²	4 lbs/resident/day	14,868
Total Alternative 2			40,091

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board.

As shown in Table 5.H, this alternative would require approximately 1,859 sf of library facility space and 12,266 books and materials.

Table 5.H: Estimated Library Needs Resulting from Proposed Project and Alternative 2

	Estimated Population Generated by the Proposed Project	Service Level Guidelines (per capita)	Library Needs
Proposed Project			
Facility Space	1,656	0.5	828 sf
Additional Books and Materials	1,656	3.3	5,465 books and materials
Alternative 2: No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning			
Facility Space	3,717	0.5	1,859 sf
Books and Materials	3,717	3.3 ³	12,266 books and materials

Compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.11-1 through 4.11-7 would be required to reduce potential public services and utilities impacts to less than significant for this alternative.

- ¹ The theoretical residential maximum potential population for the overlay is determined by multiplying the maximum proposed residential density by the multifamily (i.e., 2 or more units in structure) average household size (1.84 persons per multifamily household) for the City of Rolling Hills Estates according to the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau and the City of Rolling Hills Estates.
- ² The theoretical maximum potential population for the overlay is determined by multiplying the maximum proposed residential density by the multifamily (i.e., 2 or more units per structure) average household size (1.84 persons per household) for the City of Rolling Hills Estates according to the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau.
- ³ The Palos Verdes Library District maintains a collection of 3.3 volumes per capita (Palos Verdes Library District, letter dated January 3, 2006. Katherine Gould, District Director).

Recreation and Open Space. The No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative allows for a maximum of 2,020 dwelling units to the project area, which could potentially increase the population of the City to approximately 11,798.¹ Using the City's General Plan Parkland Acreage Requirement of 6.7 acres/1,000 residents, this alternative would require 79.0 acres of parkland. The City currently has 97 acres of parkland; therefore, neither the proposed project nor this alternative would require additional parkland. Impacts from the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would be greater than from the proposed project; however, the impacts would not be significant.

Transportation and Circulation. Transportation and circulation impacts from the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative were analyzed along with proposed project impacts. According to the City's significance criteria, 15 of the 18 local intersections are forecast to operate at LOS D or worse (and add greater than 0.02 volume to capacity (v/c) from LOS C or D or add greater than 0.01 when changed to LOS E or F) with addition of the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning in the a.m. and/or p.m. peak hours. Based on the CMP significance criteria, five of the six CMP intersections on State facilities are forecast to operate at LOS F (and add 0.02 v/c or more) during the a.m. and/or p.m. peak hours.

According to the City's significance criteria, 13 of the 18 local intersections are forecast to operate at LOS D or worse (and add greater than 0.02 v/c from LOS C or LOS D or add greater than 0.01 when changed to LOS E or LOS F) with addition of the existing overlay in the Saturday midday peak hour.

Because the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative allows more residential units and commercial square footage than does the proposed overlay, there would be greater intersection LOS impacts with the No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative than with the proposed project, and it would result in greater traffic impacts as shown in Tables 4.13.D and 4.13.E in Section 4.13.

Table 5.I compares Alternative 2 traffic impacts to those of the proposed project in the 2025 build out condition. All of these impacts could be mitigated to a less than significant level, with the exception of Crenshaw Boulevard/PCH and Hawthorne Boulevard/PCH, which would remain significant. Caltrans has programmed improvements for the Crenshaw/PCH intersection; however, Alternative 2 and traffic impacts would remain with these improvements. For the Hawthorne Boulevard intersection, there are no planned improvements and the City does not have jurisdiction over improvements in these areas.

5.4.4 Summary for Alternative 2: No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative

The No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would allow for a greater number of dwelling units and commercial square footage to the project area, which would have increased impacts when compared to the proposed project with regard to air quality, noise, population and housing, public services and utilities, recreation and open space. The No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would not avoid any of the project or cumulative significant effects,

¹ This projection was calculated by taking the 2005 SCAG population projections for the City and adding the theoretical maximum potential population for the existing Mixed-Use Overlay Zone.

Table 5.I: Proposed Project and Alternative 2 Comparison of Impacted Intersections

Intersection	2025 Baseline Plus Project		2025 Baseline Plus Alternative 2	
	Weekday	Saturday	Weekday	Saturday
Roxcove Drive/Silver Spur Road	√	√	√	√
Drybank Drive/Silver Spur Road			√	
Crossfield Drive/Silver Spur Road			√	√
Peninsula Center/Silver Spur Road			√	√
Crenshaw Boulevard/Silver Spur Road	√	√	√	√
Deep Valley Drive/Silver Spur Road	√	√	√	√
Crenshaw Boulevard/Indian Peak Road			√	
Beechgate Drive/Silver Spur Road			√	√
Indian Peak Road/Hawthorne Boulevard			√	√
Silver Spur Road/Hawthorne Boulevard	√	√	√	√
Silver Spur Road/Palos Verdes Drive North	√	√	√	√
Hawthorne Boulevard/Palos Verdes Dr North	√	√	√	√
Crenshaw Boulevard/Palos Verdes Dr North	√	√	√	√
Palos Verdes Dr East/Palos Verdes Dr North	√		√	√
Crenshaw Boulevard/ Pacific Coast Highway		Not analyzed	√	Not analyzed
Rolling Hills Road/Palos Verdes Drive North	√	√	√	√
Western (SR 213)/Palos Verdes Dr North		Not analyzed		Not analyzed
Hawthorne Boulevard/ Pacific Coast Highway	√	Not analyzed	√	Not analyzed
Western Avenue/ Pacific Coast Highway		Not analyzed	√	Not analyzed
I-110 SB ramps/ Pacific Coast Highway		Not analyzed	√	Not analyzed
I-110 NB ramps/ Pacific Coast Highway		Not analyzed	√	Not analyzed

√ = potentially significant impact without mitigation

as it results in a greater increase in population to the project area than the proposed project and would result in one additional traffic impact at the Crenshaw Boulevard/PCH intersection. The No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative would not result in additional unavoidable adverse impacts when compared to the proposed project.

5.5 ALTERNATIVE 3: RESIDENTIAL IN DISTRICT 2 ALTERNATIVE

5.5.1 Description

This alternative would allow for the proposed project; however, this alternative provides for mixed-use development within District 2. Residential density within District 2 would be consistent with the existing Mixed-Use Overlay of 22 du/ac. The maximum residential units for the proposed Overlay Zone would remain 900 dwelling units, and the maximum commercial development would be approximately 2,318,141 sf.

5.5.2 Attainment of Project Objectives

Alternative 3 would be consistent with project objectives One, Two, and Three because it would (1) provide for the orderly development of a mixed-use village in the City's main commercial area, (2) encourage a range of housing opportunities in conjunction with existing and future commercial/office uses at a density that fosters pedestrian movement, and (3) preserve regional shopping opportunities meeting the needs of the community.

5.5.3 Comparison of Impacts

Aesthetics. Implementation of Alternative 3 would significantly change views of the project area; however, it would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of consistent architectural design, improved roadways and street crossings, and the substantial increase in on-site landscaping elements. Any future development under Alternative 3 would be required to comply with all setbacks and building height requirements in the proposed development standards. This alternative would allow for a higher residential density in District 2 than the proposed project; however, this alternative would not have the same number of allowable residential units as the proposed project overall.

Air Quality. Because Alternative 3 would have the same maximum number of residential units as would the proposed project, impacts to air quality are expected to be identical to those analyzed for the proposed project. Mitigation Measures 4.2-1 through 4.2-6 would be applicable to the proposed project as well as to this alternative.

Biological Resources. Project impacts to biological resources were analyzed and found to be less than significant because of their lack of presence in the project area. In addition, because the project site is disturbed, located within an urban setting, and separated from any open space by roadways and development, it is not considered an integral component of any wildlife movement corridors in the area. A small portion of the proposed project area is located within the Ecological Overlay Zone.

Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would apply to this alternative in order to mitigate any impacts to the Ecological Overlay Zone to a less than significant level. Because this alternative would have the same impact to the project area as the proposed project, impacts associated with this alternative would be less than significant.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Impacts from this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project. No archaeological, paleontological, or historic resources were identified through the records search or field survey on the project site. However, the project site may contain unknown subsurface archeological or paleontological resources, and several of the buildings within the project area are approaching the 50-year threshold for significance evaluation. Therefore, evaluation of these structures by individual projects, as outlined in Mitigation Measure 4.4-3, would be required. Impacts to historical resources would be similar to those of the proposed project because the area for this alternative is the same as the proposed project area.

A paleontological locality search conducted for the project site indicates that sensitive paleontological sediments that contain fossil remains may exist within the project area. Therefore, monitoring during construction, as outlined in Mitigation Measures 4.4-4 and 4.4-5 would be required. Impacts to paleontological resources would be similar to those of the proposed project because the area for this alternative is the same as the proposed project area.

Geology and Soils. This alternative would have the same impacts related to geology and soils as the proposed project because the areas are the same. The project impacts to subsidence were analyzed and found to be less than significant. The project site is not located within an area of known subsidence that may be associated with groundwater or petroleum withdrawal, peat oxidation, or hydrocompaction. Therefore, impacts resulting from Alternative 3 related to geology and soils would be less than significant.

The geologic analysis for the project identified several potentially significant geologic effects, including ground shaking, surface fault rupture, landslides, liquefaction, lateral spreading, erosion potential, and expansive soils. Therefore, it is expected that this alternative would require the same mitigation measures as the proposed project. Mitigation Measures 4.5-1 to 4.5-3 would reduce the impacts of the proposed project and this alternative to below a level of significance.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Upon implementation of the project, there is the potential for significant hazardous substance impacts with regard to the Hazards Management Overlay Zone/Fire Hazard, hazardous materials sites and contamination, and emergency response or evacuation plan. The project site is located within the City's Hazard Management Overlay Zone due to its proximity to certain vegetation types that are susceptible to fire. The existing Mixed-Use Overlay and the proposed project would allow residential uses that do not currently exist within a fire hazard area. The proposed project or Alternative 3, however, would not increase the fire hazards present in the project area beyond existing conditions since the project area is completely developed with urban uses. There is the potential for construction activities within the project area to result in human and environmental exposure to hazardous materials from unknown sources or hazardous sites identified in Table 4.6.B (Section 4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials). Alternative 3 and the proposed project could allow

residential uses within the project area that do not currently exist to impact the City's MHFP with regard to evacuation routes. Upon implementation of the proposed project or this Alternative, compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-3 would prevent significant impacts related to fire hazards.

As with the proposed project, this alternative has the potential to cause short-term interference with existing emergency response plans because construction activities within the project area could involve roadway detours and closure of existing driveways currently used for access by emergency vehicles or used as an evacuation route. To ensure that emergency vehicles will continue to have access to the project site during construction and that all evacuation routes will remain open during construction activities (Mitigation Measures 4.13-1 and 4.13-2), implementation of a City-approved traffic management plan for each project within the project area would reduce potential short term emergency response or evacuation plan impacts to a less than significant level for this alternative.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be the same as those of the proposed project because the project area is currently built out. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.7-1 through 4.7-4, the proposed project and Alternative 3 would not result in a significant hydrology or water quality impacts.

Land Use. Impacts to land use associated with Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the proposed project with the exception of District 2. The changes in lot coverage ratios and building height as a result of the proposed project or Alternative 3 would have a minimal impact on surrounding uses since the majority of changes would occur internal to the project site vicinity and where the topography provides a natural barrier to surrounding uses. The hours of operation of the project or Alternative 3 would change with the introduction of residential uses though the effects will increase conformance with the surrounding residential areas.

Noise. Although Alternative 3 allows residential uses in District 2, the allowable maximum dwelling units in the project area would be the same as for the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would not introduce any additional sensitive receptors to the project area, and noise impacts resulting from Alternative 3 would be the same as for the proposed project.

Population and Housing. Alternative 3 would allow for the same amount of development to the project area as the proposed project: a maximum of 900 dwelling units, which could potentially accommodate a maximum population of 1,656 persons on the project site. Both the proposed project and this alternative would exceed SCAG projections; therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 would apply to the proposed project and Alternative 3.

Public Services and Utilities. Tables 5.C through 5.H above show the amount of water, electricity, natural gas, wastewater, solid waste, and library services required under the proposed project. Because this alternative would introduce the same number of dwelling units to the project area as the proposed project, impacts to public services and utilities would be the same as for the proposed

project. With the exception of library services, impacts to public services and utilities would be less than significant.

Recreation and Open Space. Because this alternative would introduce the same number of dwelling units to the project area as the proposed project, impacts to recreation and open space would be the same as for the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation. Alternative 3 would allow for the same amount of development to the project area as the proposed project: a maximum of 900 dwelling units and a maximum of 2,318,141 sf of commercial area. Traffic impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project or Alternative 3. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.13-1 through 4.13-12, the potentially significant signal warrant, parking, and access impacts associated with the project would be reduced to less than significant levels. The significant project and cumulative impact at Hawthorne Boulevard/PCH would remain because there are no improvements planned at this intersection and the City has no jurisdiction over improvements in this area.

5.5.4 Summary for Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would allow for the same number of dwelling units and commercial square footage to the project area; however, Alternative 3 would distribute the allowed dwelling units throughout the project area differently than the proposed project, allowing residential use in District 2. Impacts from Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the proposed project. The significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project or Alternative 3 include construction air quality, long-term operational air quality effects due to vehicle emissions, cumulative long-term air quality impacts, and traffic impacts to the Hawthorne Boulevard/PCH intersection. The proposed project and Alternative 3 would not have significant project or cumulative impacts on aesthetics, biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services and utilities, recreation and open space.

5.6 ALTERNATIVE 4: RESIDENTIAL WEST OF DRY BANK DRIVE ALTERNATIVE

5.6.1 Description

This alternative would allow for the proposed project; however, this alternative would provide for mixed-use development west of Dry Bank Drive including property currently occupied by the Avenue and Peninsula Center Shopping Centers. Residential density within the area west of Dry Bank Drive would be consistent with the existing Mixed-Use Overlay of 22 du/ac. The maximum residential units for the proposed Overlay Zone would be 900 dwelling units, and the maximum commercial development would be approximately 2,318,141 sf.

5.6.2 Attainment of Project Objectives

The Residential West of Dry Bank Alternative would be generally consistent with the Project Objectives. This alternative would provide for the orderly development of a mixed-use village in the City's main commercial area. This alternative would encourage a range of housing opportunities in conjunction with existing and future commercial/office uses at a density that fosters pedestrian movement. Regional shopping opportunities meeting the needs of the community would not be preserved, nor would this alternative provide a concentration of units as anticipated in the proposed project.

5.6.3 Comparison of Impacts

Aesthetics. Implementation of Alternative 4 would change views of the project area; however, with implementation of design guidelines, it would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of consistent architectural design, improved roadways and street crossings, and the substantial increase in on-site landscaping elements. Any future development under Alternative 4 would be required to comply with all setbacks and building height requirements in the proposed development standards.

Air Quality. Alternative 4 would allow the same number of residential units and amount of commercial square footage as the proposed project; however, the allowed residential and commercial area would be spread throughout the project area (both east and west of Dry Bank Drive). As described below for traffic, the traffic distribution is not substantially different between Alternative 4 and the proposed project. As there is no substantial change in traffic patterns, Alternative 4 would continue to have significant air quality impacts similar to the proposed project.

Biological Resources. Project impacts to biological resources were analyzed and found to be less than significant because of their lack of presence in the project area. In addition, because the project site is disturbed, located within an urban setting, and separated from any open space by roadways and development, it is not considered an integral component of any wildlife movement corridors in the area. A small portion of the proposed project area is located within the Ecological Overlay Zone. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would apply to this alternative in order to mitigate any impacts to the Ecological Overlay Zone to a less than significant level. Because this alternative would have the same impact to the project area as the proposed project, impacts associated with this alternative would be less than significant.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Impacts from this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project. No archaeological, paleontological, or historic resources were identified through the records search or field survey on the project site. However, the project site may contain unknown subsurface archeological or paleontological resources, and several of the buildings within the project area are approaching the 50-year threshold for significance evaluation. Therefore, evaluation of these structures by individual projects, as identified in Mitigation Measure 4.4-3, would be required. Impacts to historical resources would be similar to impacts of the proposed project because the project area for this alternative is the same as the proposed project.

A paleontological locality search conducted for the project site indicates that sensitive paleontological sediments that contain fossil remains may exist within the project area. Therefore, monitoring during construction as identified in Mitigation Measures 4.4-4 and 4.4-5 would be required. Impacts to paleontological resources would be similar to impacts of the proposed project because the project area for this alternative is the same as the proposed project.

Geology and Soils. This alternative would have the same impacts related to geology and soils as the proposed project because the proposed project area is the same. The project impacts to subsidence were analyzed and found to be less than significant. The project site is not located within an area of known subsidence that may be associated with groundwater or petroleum withdrawal, peat oxidation, or hydrocompaction. Therefore, impacts resulting from Alternative 4, related to geology and soils, would be less than significant.

The geologic analysis for the project identified several potentially significant geologic effects, including ground shaking, surface fault rupture, landslides, liquefaction, lateral spreading, erosion potential, and expansive soils. Therefore, it is expected that this alternative would require the same mitigation measures as the proposed project. Mitigation Measures 4.5-1 to 4.5-3 would reduce the impacts of the proposed project and this alternative to below a level of significance.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Because the project area is the same as the proposed project, impacts resulting from this alternative related to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar to those of the proposed project. There is the potential for construction activities within the project area to result in human and environmental exposure to hazardous materials from unknown sources or hazardous sites identified in Table 4.6.B (Section 4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials). Alternative 4 and the proposed project could allow residential uses within the project area that do not currently exist to impact the City's MHFP with regard to evacuation routes. Upon implementation of the proposed project or this Alternative, compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-3 would reduce potential impacts related to fire hazards to less than significant.

As with the proposed project, this alternative has the potential to cause short-term interference with existing emergency response plans because construction activities within the project area could involve roadway detours and closure of existing driveways currently used for access by emergency vehicles or used as an evacuation route. Implementation of a City-approved traffic management plan for each project within the project area, to ensure that emergency vehicles will continue to have access to the project site during construction and that all evacuation routes will remain open during construction activities (Mitigation Measures 4.13-1 and 4.13-2) would reduce potential short-term emergency response or evacuation plan impacts to a less than significant level for this alternative.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be the same as for the proposed project because the project area is currently built out. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.7-1 through 4.7-4, the impacts of the proposed project or Alternative 4 on hydrology or water quality would be reduced to less than significant.

Land Use. Impacts to land use associated with Alternative 4 would be similar to those of the proposed project. The changes in lot coverage ratios and building height as a result of the proposed project or Alternative 4 would have a minimal impact on surrounding uses since the majority of changes would occur internal to the project site vicinity and where the topography provides a natural barrier to surrounding uses. The hours of operation of the project or Alternative 4 would change with the introduction of residential uses though the effects will increase conformance with the surrounding residential areas.

Noise. Although Alternative 4 allows residential use west of Dry Bank Drive, and the distribution of residential uses within the project area would differ from that of the proposed project, the allowable maximum dwelling units in the project area would be the same as for the proposed project. Traffic distribution would not substantially differ from traffic distribution of the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would not introduce any additional sensitive receptors to the project area, and noise impacts resulting from Alternative 4 would be the same as the proposed project.

Population and Housing. Alternative 4 would allow for the same amount of development to the project area as the proposed project: a maximum of 900 dwelling units, which could potentially accommodate a maximum population of 1,656 persons on the project site. Both the proposed project and this alternative would exceed SCAG projections; therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 would apply to the proposed project and Alternative 4.

Public Services and Utilities. Tables 5.C through 5.H above show the amount of water, electricity, natural gas, wastewater, solid waste, and library services required under the proposed project. Because this alternative would introduce the same number of residents to the project area as the proposed project, impacts to public services and utilities would be the same as for the proposed project. Impacts to public services and utilities would be less than significant.

Recreation and Open Space. Because this alternative would introduce the same number of residents to the project area as the proposed project, impacts to recreation and open space would be the same as for the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation. Alternative 4 would allow for the same amount of development to the project area as the proposed project, a maximum of 900 dwelling units, and a maximum of 2,318,141 sf of commercial area. Development of Alternative 4 would distribute traffic trips in essentially the same pattern as the proposed project (see Appendix J); therefore, traffic impacts as a result of Alternative 4 would be the same as for the proposed project with project and cumulative impacts at the Hawthorne Boulevard/PCH intersection remaining significant.

5.6.4 Summary for Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would allow for the same number of dwelling units and commercial square footage to the project area. However, Alternative 4 would distribute the allowed dwelling units throughout the project area, both east and west of Dry Bank Drive. Impacts from Alternative 4 would be similar to those of the proposed project. The significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project include construction air quality, long-term operational air quality effects due to vehicle emissions, cumulative long-term air quality impacts, and project and cumulative traffic impacts at the Hawthorne Boulevard/PCH intersection. The proposed project and Alternative 4 would not have significant project or cumulative impacts on aesthetics, biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services and utilities, recreation and open space.

5.7 ALTERNATIVE 5: REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

5.7.1 Description

The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the allowable residential and commercial uses by 20 percent in order to minimize or avoid the significant project and cumulative traffic impacts associated with the proposed project. This alternative would allow a maximum number of 720 residential units, excluding District 2, and a maximum commercial development of 2,247,481 sf of commercial use throughout the project area. Residential uses would be permitted throughout the entire project area, not limited to the area between Dry Bank Drive and Crenshaw Boulevard. See Table 5.J for a comparison of the proposed project and the Reduced Project Alternative. This table depicts the additional square footage of commercial and not the existing commercial square feet in the project area.

Table 5.J: Proposed Project in Comparison to the Reduced Project Alternative

Land Use	Proposed Project	Reduced Project Alternative
East of Dry Bank Drive (34.21 acres)		
Residential	900 dwelling units	720 dwelling units
Retail	289,619 sf	No reduction
Restaurant	32,180 sf	No reduction
Office	321,799 sf	257,439 sf
West of Dry Bank Drive (57.61 acres)		
Residential	0	No reduction
Retail	405,000 sf	No reduction
Restaurant	13,500 sf	No reduction
Office	31,500 sf	25,200 sf

5.7.2 Attainment of Project Objectives

The Reduced Project Alternative would be consistent with each of the project objectives because it would (1) provide for the orderly development of a mixed-use village in the City's main commercial area, (2) encourage a range of housing opportunities in conjunction with existing and future

commercial/office uses at a density that fosters pedestrian movement, and (3) preserve regional shopping opportunities, thus meeting the needs of the community.

5.7.3 Comparison of Impacts

Aesthetics. Implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would impact the same area as the proposed project; however, this alternative would have fewer units and would potentially result in fewer buildings or lower buildings within the project area than the proposed project since there are fewer units over a larger area. Visual character or quality of the site would not be degraded to the degree of the proposed project because of the proposed reduced density and consistent architectural design, improved roadways and street crossings, and the substantial increase in on-site landscaping elements. Any future development under the Reduced Project Alternative would be required to comply with all setbacks and building height requirements in the proposed development standards. The potential visual impacts of this alternative are considered less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality. Because the Reduced Project Alternative would have fewer residential units than the proposed project, impacts to air quality are expected to be reduced from those analyzed for the proposed project, as shown in Table 5.K. However, the emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ remain above SCAQMD thresholds and thus are significant. See Appendix J for model output.

Biological Resources. Impacts to biological resources would be the same as for the proposed project because the project areas are the same. Project impacts to biological resources were analyzed and found to be less than significant because of their lack of presence in the project area. In addition, because the project site is disturbed, located within an urban setting, and separated from any open space by roadways and development, it is not considered an integral component of any wildlife movement corridors in the area. A small portion of the proposed project area is located within the Ecological Overlay Zone. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would apply to this alternative in order to mitigate any impacts to the Ecological Overlay Zone to a less than significant level. Because this alternative would have the same impact to the project area as the proposed project, impacts associated with this alternative would be less than significant.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Impacts from this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project because the project areas are the same. No archaeological, paleontological, or historic resources were identified through the records search or field survey on the project site. However, the project site may contain unknown subsurface archeological or paleontological resources and several of the buildings within the project area are approaching the 50-year threshold for significance evaluation. Therefore, evaluation of these structures by individual projects as outlined in Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 would be required. Impacts to historical resources would be similar to those resulting from the proposed project because the project area for this alternative is the same as the proposed project.

Table 5.K: Reduced Project Alternative Operational Emissions (2025)

Source	Pollutant Emissions, lbs/day				
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀
Existing Land Uses					
Weekday					
Stationary Sources	20	19	20	0.0	0.0
Commercial/Retail/Office Mobile Sources	101	141	1,126	2.5	434
Total Weekday Emissions	120	160	1,146	2.5	434
Weekend					
Stationary Sources	20	19	20	0.0	0.0
Commercial/Retail/Office Mobile Sources	114	163	1,300	2.9	501
Total Weekend Emissions	134	182	1,320	2.9	501
Proposed Overlay					
Weekday					
Stationary Sources	72	29	22	0.0	0.3
Residential Mobile Sources	14	13	103	0.2	38
Commercial/Retail/Office Mobile Sources	127	181	1,453	3.3	560
Total Weekday Emissions	213	223	1,578	3.5	598
Net Weekday Emissions Change	93	63	432	1.0	164
Weekend					
Stationary Sources	72	29	22	0.0	0.3
Residential Mobile Sources	14	14	106	0.2	39
Commercial/Retail/Office Mobile Sources	149	217	1,745	3.9	672
Total Weekend Emissions	235	260	1,873	4.2	711
Net Weekend Emissions Change	101	78	553	1.3	210
Reduced Project Alternative					
Weekday					
Stationary Sources	62	27	21	0.01	0.21
Residential Mobile Sources	11	10	82	0.18	30
Commercial/Retail/Office Mobile Sources	124	178	1,421	3.1	547
Total Weekday Emissions	196	214	1,525	3.3	578
Net Weekday Change from Proposed	-17	-9	-53	-0.19	-20
Net Weekday Change from Existing	76	55	379	0.84	144
Weekend					
Stationary Sources	62	27	21	0.01	0.21
Residential Mobile Sources	11	10	85	0.19	31
Commercial/Retail/Office Mobile Sources	148	217	1,734	3.8	668
Total Weekend Emissions	221	254	1,840	4.0	700
Net Weekend Change from Proposed	-15	-6	-33	0	-12
Net Weekend Change from Existing	87	72	521	1	198
Significant impact?¹ (Weekday/Weekend)	Yes/Yes	No/Yes	No/No	No/No	No/Yes
SCAQMD threshold	55	55	550	150	150

Source: LSA Associates, Inc., October 2006

¹ Significance determined by comparing the net emissions change from existing land uses to the reduced project alternative with the SCAQMD thresholds.

A paleontological locality search conducted for the project site indicates that sensitive paleontological sediments that contain fossil remains may exist within the project area. Therefore, monitoring during construction as identified in Mitigation Measures 4.4-4 and 4.4-5 would be required. Impacts to paleontological resources would be similar to those of the proposed project because the project area for this alternative is the same as the proposed project.

Geology and Soils. This alternative would have the same impacts related to geology and soils as the proposed project because the proposed project area is the same. The project impacts to subsidence were analyzed and found to be less than significant. The project site is not located within an area of known subsidence that may be associated with groundwater or petroleum withdrawal, peat oxidation, or hydrocompaction. Therefore, impacts resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative, related to geology and soils, would be less than significant.

The geologic analysis for the project identified several potentially significant geologic effects, including ground shaking, surface fault rupture, landslides, liquefaction, lateral spreading, erosion potential, and expansive soils. Therefore, it is expected that this alternative would require the same mitigation measures as the proposed project. Mitigation Measures 4.5-1 to 4.5-3 would reduce the proposed project and this alternative's impacts to below a level of significance.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. This alternative would have the same impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as the proposed project because the project areas are the same. However, the reduced number of units and commercial uses would lower the generation, use, and disposal of household hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be the similar to those of the proposed project. However, fewer dwelling units and commercial uses would reduce concentration of potential pollutants in runoff.

Land Use. Impacts to land use associated with the Reduced Project Alternative would be less than the impacts of the proposed project because of the reduced residential and commercial density to the project area. The reduction in residential units and commercial uses associated with the Reduced Project Alternative would have a minimal impact on surrounding uses since the majority of changes would occur internal to the project site vicinity and where the topography provides a natural barrier to surrounding uses. Similar to the proposed project, the hours of operation of the Reduced Project Alternative would change with the introduction of residential uses though the effects will increase conformance with the surrounding residential areas. Similar to the proposed project, potential land use impacts are considered less than significant.

Noise. Noise impacts resulting from this alternative would be a reduction from those of the proposed project because of the reduction in residential and commercial uses and therefore the reduction in sensitive receptors. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.9-1 through 4.9-3, noise impacts are reduced to less than significant.

Population and Housing. The Reduced Project Alternative calls for a 20 percent reduction of residential units (a maximum of 720 dwelling units). This alternative could potentially accommodate a maximum population of 389 persons on the project site, a reduction of 1,267 persons (1,656 persons – 389 persons) from the proposed project. Both the proposed project and this alternative would exceed SCAG projections. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 would apply to the proposed project and the Reduced Project Alternative, and potential impacts are reduced to less than significant.

Public Services and Utilities. Tables 5.C through 5.H above show the amount of water, electricity, natural gas, wastewater, solid waste, and library services required under the proposed project. Because this alternative would introduce fewer residents to the project area than the proposed project, impacts to public services and utilities would be less than the impacts of the proposed project. Therefore, impacts to public services and utilities would be considered less than significant.

Recreation and Open Space. Because this alternative would introduce fewer residents to the project area than would the proposed project, impacts to recreation and open space would be less than impacts of the proposed project. As stated above, this alternative could introduce a maximum population to the city of approximately 8,470 persons, which would require 56.7 acres of parkland. The City currently has 97 acres of parkland; therefore, impacts to recreation and open space would be less than significant.

Transportation and Circulation. The traffic impact analysis prepared for the proposed Peninsula Village Overlay Zone determined that one intersection outside of the City's jurisdiction would be significantly impacted by the proposed project:

- Hawthorne Boulevard/PCH (SR-1)

This intersection was forecast to operate at LOS F with and without the project; however, the proposed project would increase the intersection's ICU by 2 percent or more over the baseline condition (2025 No Project) in the a.m. peak hour, which is considered a significant impact by the CMP.

This intersection is located in the City of Torrance but is within the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the Los Angeles County CMP. For the intersection of Hawthorne Boulevard/PCH (SR-1), the installation of a dedicated northbound right-turn lane on a vacant lot would mitigate project impacts; however, the City of Rolling Hills Estates has no jurisdiction over this area in order to make the needed improvement, nor have any improvements to this intersection been identified by the City of Torrance or Caltrans.

Further traffic analyses were conducted (Appendix J), and it was determined that a reduction of 20 percent of the proposed residential and office uses under the proposed overlay would reduce the project impact at Hawthorne Boulevard/PCH to a less than significant level (i.e., ICU contributions of

less than two percent in the peak hours). The table below shows the reductions in the proposed land uses:

Land Use	Proposed Size	Reduced Size
East of Drybank Drive (34.21 acres)		
Residential	900 du	600 du
Retail	289,619 sf	no reduction
Restaurant	32,180 sf	no reduction
Office	321,799 sf	257,439 sf
West of Drybank Drive (57.61 acres)		
Residential	0	120 du
Retail	405,000 sf	no reduction
Restaurant	13,500 sf	no reduction
Office	31,500 sf	25,200 sf

With the 20 percent reduction to residential and office uses in the proposed PVOZ, the overall project trip generation would be revised to 62,745 daily trips, 1,919 a.m. peak-hour trips (1,212 inbound and 707 outbound), and 6,036 p.m. peak-hour trips (2,844 inbound and 3,192 outbound).

The revised trip generation of the proposed project was analyzed per the methodology described in the traffic impact analysis and, based on the revised traffic impact analysis, the project impact at the Hawthorne Boulevard/PCH would be reduced to a less than significant level in the a.m. peak hour (i.e., ICU contributions of less than 2 percent).

With the reduced alternative, the project traffic impact at this CMP intersection would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

Table 5.L compares Alternative 5 traffic impacts to those of the proposed project in the 2025 build out condition. According to the City's significance criteria, 9 of the 18 local intersections are forecast to operate at LOS D or worse (and add greater than 0.02 volume to capacity [v/c] from LOS C or D or add greater than 0.01 when changed to LOS E or LOS F) with addition of the Reduced Project Alternative in the a.m. and/or p.m. peak hours. The traffic impacts of Alternative 5 would be mitigated to a less than significant level and the significant project and cumulative impacts at the Hawthorne Boulevard/PCH intersection, identified for the proposed project, would be avoided.

Table 5.L: Proposed Project and Alternative 5 Comparison of Impacted Intersections

Intersection	2025 Baseline Plus Project		2025 Baseline Plus Alternative 5	
	Weekday	Saturday	Weekday	Saturday
Roxcove Drive/Silver Spur Road	√	√	√	√
Crenshaw Boulevard/Silver Spur Road	√	√	√	√
Deep Valley Drive/Silver Spur Road	√	√	√	√
Silver Spur Road/Hawthorne Boulevard	√	√	√	√
Silver Spur Road/Palos Verdes Drive North	√	√	√	√
Hawthorne Boulevard/Palos Verdes Dr North	√	√	√	√
Crenshaw Boulevard/Palos Verdes Dr North	√	√	√	√
Palos Verdes Dr East/Palos Verdes Dr North	√		√	
Rolling Hills Road/Palos Verdes Drive North	√	√	√	√

√ = potentially significant impact without mitigation

5.7.4 Summary for Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would allow for a 20 percent reduction from the proposed project in the number of dwelling units and reduced commercial square footage to the project area. Impacts related to air quality, noise, population and housing, public services and utilities, recreation and open space, and transportation and circulation from Alternative 5 would be less than those of the proposed project because of the reduction in residential and commercial uses. Impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and land use associated with Alternative 5 would be the same as the impacts from the proposed project because the project area is the same. The significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project including construction air quality, long-term operational air quality effects due to vehicle emissions, and cumulative long-term air quality impacts would remain with Alternative 5. Significant project and cumulative traffic impacts at the Hawthorne Boulevard/PCH intersection are avoided with Alternative 5. The proposed project and Alternative 5 would not have a significant impact on aesthetics, biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services and utilities, recreation and open space, or transportation and circulation.

5.8 COMPARISON OF ALL ALTERNATIVES

As stated in section 5.1, the primary objective of the alternatives analysis is to focus on alternatives capable of eliminating identified, unmitigated, significant environmental effects, or reducing them to a level of insignificance, even if those alternatives would not attain the basic project objectives or are more costly. Table 5.M provides a matrix that compares of each alternative and indicates whether the proposed alternatives have similar, greater, or fewer impacts than the proposed project. Each alternative has a different combination of effects that are similar to, greater than, or less than the proposed project.

Table 5.M: Peninsula Village Overlay Zone Comparison of Impacts for Alternatives

	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative	Alternative 2: No Project/General Plan/Existing Zoning Alternative	Alternative 3: Residential in District 2	Alternative 4: Residential West of Dry Bank Drive	Alternative 5: Reduced Project Alternative
Attainment of Project Objectives	Meets all project objectives	Meets project objective 2	Meets none of the project objectives	Meets all project objectives	Meets project objectives 1 and 2	Meets all project objectives
Aesthetics	NS	-	N	N	N	-
Air Quality	S	-	+	N	N	-
Biological Resources	NS	-	N	N	N	N
Cultural and Scientific Resources	NS	-	N	N	N	N
Geology and Soils	NS	-	N	N	N	N
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	NS	-	N	N	N	-
Hydrology and Water Quality	NS	-	N	N	N	-
Land Use and Planning	NS	-	N	N	N	-
Noise	NS	-	+	N	N	-
Population and Housing	NS	-	+	N	N	-
Public Services and Utilities	NS	-	+	N	N	-
Recreation and Open Space	NS	-	+	N	N	-
Transportation and Circulation	S	-	+	N	N	-

For proposed project impacts:

S = Significant unavoidable impacts

NS = No significant impact with mitigation incorporated

For project alternative impacts:

+ = Greater impacts than proposed project

- = Less or incrementally fewer impacts than the proposed project

N = Neutral (doesn't appreciably change impacts)

5.9 IDENTIFICATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The No Project/No Build Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project because there are no physical impacts that would result from implementation of this alternative. If there were no changes to the existing conditions on site, there would be no increase in traffic, noise, construction, or operational air emissions, or additional population causing an impact to library services. The CEQA Guidelines require that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, “the EIR also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e][2]).

The operational effects of Alternatives 3 and 4 would have the same or similar impacts as the proposed project. The operational effects of the proposed project and Alternatives 2 and 5 are qualitatively different, as the number of proposed dwelling units and proposed commercial square footage differs. Alternative 2 would have an increase in impacts with regard to air quality, noise, population and housing, public services and utilities, recreation and open space, and transportation and circulation. Alternative 5 would have a reduction in impacts with regard to aesthetics, air quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services and utilities, recreation and open space, and transportation and circulation.

The Reduced Project Alternative (Alternative 5) is superior with regard to aesthetics, air quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services and utilities, recreation and open space, and traffic and circulation impacts. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in a reduction in traffic impacts and, in this regard, is superior to the proposed project, which would result in significant impacts at one intersection even after mitigation. All study area intersections would operate with an improved or equivalent level of service with implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative compared with the proposed project.

Other significant impacts associated with the proposed project would not be reduced with alternative development scenarios. For example, short-term air quality and hazardous impacts as a result of demolition and grading would not vary substantially under any of the build alternatives.

Therefore, it is determined that Alternative 5, the Reduced Project Alternative, is the environmentally superior alternative.