

CHAPTER 6: ALTERNATIVES

6.1 - Introduction

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.6, this chapter contains a comparative impact assessment of alternatives to the project. The primary purpose of an alternatives analysis under CEQA is to provide decision-makers and the public with a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the project that could attain most of the basic project objectives, while avoiding or reducing any of the project's significant adverse environmental effects.

Analysis of two alternatives to the project is provided for informational purposes and to allow decision-makers to consider the project in light of hypothetical alternative development scenarios, thereby promoting CEQA's purpose as an information disclosure statute. This analysis is guided by the following considerations set forth under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6:

- An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project;
- An EIR should identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process;
- Reasons for rejecting an alternative include:
 - Failure to meet most of the basic project objectives;
 - Infeasibility; or
 - Inability to avoid significant environmental effects.

6.2 - Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The project was analyzed for potentially significant impacts related to each of the environmental issues discussed in Sections 3.1 through 3.18. The results of the analysis indicate that the project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- **Project Level:** Operational impact related to unacceptable Level of Service (LOS) at Coggins Drive at Las Juntas Way intersection under Opening Year with Project
- **Cumulative Level:** Operational impact related to unacceptable LOS at Coggins Drive at Las Juntas Way intersection under Cumulative Year with Project.

Mitigation measures were identified for aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, geology/soils, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, noise, and transportation impacts that would reduce the impacts to less than significant.

6.3 - Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this EIR presents a range of reasonable alternatives to the project for analysis and evaluation of their comparative merits. These alternatives are considered to cover the range of development alternatives that would meet the basic objectives of the project while lessening one or more of its significant impacts. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) states that an EIR need not evaluate every conceivable alternative to a project. Information has been provided for each alternative that would allow meaningful comparison with the project.

CEQA requires that an EIR analyze a “no project” alternative (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(e)). Where, as here, this alternative means a project would not proceed, the discussion “[sh]ould compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the project is approved” (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(e)(3)(B)). Another type of alternative to be considered includes consideration of what could reasonably be expected in the foreseeable future if the project is not approved, based on current land use plans/designations/zoning and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. In addition, given the significant and unavoidable historic resources alternative under the project, a type of historic preservation alternative is to be considered.

The two alternatives to the project analyzed in this chapter are as follows:

- **No Project Alternative:** Under the No Project Alternative, the 284-unit 6-story podium apartment community proposed under the project would not be constructed on the project site. In this scenario, the two existing single-family homes and garage on the project site would remain, road improvements would not occur, trees would not be removed or impacted, grading would not take place, and the five parcels would not be merged into one parcel. This alternative would not require a General Plan Amendment, rezoning, minor subdivision, or a Final Development Plan.
- **Reduced Scale Alternative:** Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes (22 units per acre on 2.37 acres) would be constructed on the project site. While this alternative would reduce the overall intensity of development on the project site, it would still require the development of the entire project site. In this scenario, the number of market rate units would decrease by 82 percent (248 units down to 44 units) and the number of affordable units would decrease by 78 percent (36 units down to 8 units). Similar to the project, the two existing single-family homes and garage on the project site would be demolished. However, no below ground parking would be constructed under this alternative.

6.4 - Project Objectives

As stated in Chapter 2, Project Description, the objectives of the project are to:

- Address the regional housing and employment imbalance by providing 284 housing units to an underserved area.

- Reduce traffic on area roads by increasing housing density in an area well served by regional public transportation (Bay Area Rapid Transit [BART]).
- Provide much needed affordable housing through the delivery of 36 affordable units.
- Provide housing within a nearby commercial area that provides neighborhood services that are accessible to the new residents.
- Create an apartment community consisting of high-quality architecture that encourages the walkability within the neighborhood.
- Implement policies of importance to the County, as reflected in the Contra Costa County General Plan.
- Encourage infill redevelopment of underused sites in areas served by adequate infrastructure and services that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to encourage multiple-family housing located in proximity to transit corridors.

6.5 - Alternative 1—No Project Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires EIRs to evaluate a “No Project Alternative,” which is defined as the “circumstance under which the project does not proceed.” Under the No Project Alternative, the 284-unit 6-story podium apartment community proposed under the project would not be constructed on the project site. In this scenario, the two existing single-family homes and garage on the project site would remain, road improvements would not occur, trees would not be removed or impacted, and grading would not take place. This alternative would not require a General Plan Amendment, rezoning, minor subdivision, or a Final Development Plan.

6.5.1 - Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed with a 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking. The two existing residential buildings and garage would remain on-site, and existing trees would not be removed or impacted. The new residential units, recreational amenities, and road improvements would not be constructed and operated on the project site. There would be no change in visual character, views, nighttime lighting, daytime glare, or shadow, as there would be no change to the existing on-site buildings, parking area, streets, utility lines, topography, or vegetation/landscaping. Thus, there would be no aesthetics impacts under this alternative.

The project impacts related to aesthetics would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.1, Aesthetics). The No Project Alternative would have a lower level of aesthetic impacts compared to the project; however, this alternative would not meet the project objectives related to residential facilities in terms of visual character, as this alternative would not create an apartment community consisting of architecture and design that encourages walkability within the neighborhood.

Air Quality

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no change related to criteria pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions, as there would be no project-related construction or changes to the existing land use. Thus, there would be no impact related to air quality under this alternative.

The project impacts related to air quality would be less than significant with mitigation for criteria pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions generation. While the No Project Alternative would result in no increase in criteria pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions generation impacts compared to existing conditions, this alternative would not meet the project objectives related to air quality. In contrast to the project, this alternative would not reduce traffic on area roads by increasing housing density in an area well-served by regional public transportation, nor would it encourage the walkability of the neighborhood.

Biological Resources

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed with a 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking. The two existing residential buildings and garage would remain on-site and trees would not be removed or impacted. There would be no change related to wildlife or habitat on-site. The No Project Alternative would not have potential impacts to special-status bats or nesting birds, nor would it require a tree-removal permit. Thus, there would be no biological resources impacted under this alternative.

The project impacts related to biological resources would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.3, Biological Resources). The No Project Alternative would have a lower level of biological resources impact compared to the project; however, this alternative would not meet the project objectives related to residential facilities in terms of biological resources, as this alternative would not encourage infill redevelopment of underutilized sites in areas served by adequate infrastructure and services that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to encourage multiple-family housing located in proximity to transit corridors.

Cultural Resources

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed with a 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking. The two existing residential buildings and garage would remain on-site and trees would not be removed or impacted. As such, there would be no change in historic or archeological resources, as there would be no change to the existing on-site buildings and no ground disturbance. Thus, there would be no cultural resources impacts under this alternative.

The project impacts related to cultural resources would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.4, Cultural Resources). The No Project Alternative would have a lower level of cultural resources impact compared to the project. However, this alternative would not meet the project objectives related to residential facilities, as this alternative would not provide housing within a nearby commercial area that provides neighborhood services that are accessible to the new residents. Furthermore, there are no project objectives related to cultural resources.

Energy

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no change related to energy consumption, as there would be no change to the existing land uses or daily vehicle trips. Thus, there would be no impact related to energy under this alternative.

The project impacts related to energy would be less than significant. The No Project Alternative would not construct the residential apartment building, and would therefore result in a lower level of energy consumption compared to the project. However, the No Project Alternative would not meet the project objectives related to energy conservation because this alternative would not result in the reduction in traffic on area roads that would be associated with increasing housing density in an area well served by regional public transportation.

Geology and Soils

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed with a 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking. The two existing residential buildings and garage would remain on-site and trees would not be removed or impacted. The new residential units, new recreational amenities, and road improvements would not be constructed and operated on the project site. Thus, there would be no impact related to potential exposure of persons and property to seismic- and soil-related hazards under this alternative, nor would there be potential paleontological impacts. There would be no impact with regard to geology and soils under the No Project Alternative.

The project impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.6, Geology and Soils). The No Project Alternative would have a lower level of geology and soils impact compared to the project, as it would not construct housing in a seismically active area. This alternative would not meet the project objectives related to addressing the regional housing and employment imbalance by providing 284 housing units to an underserved area. Furthermore, there are no project objectives related to geology and soils.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no change related to GHG emission generation, as there would be no change to the existing land uses or daily vehicle trips. Thus, there would be no impact related to GHG emissions under this alternative.

The No Project Alternative would eliminate energy consumption and the associated GHG emissions resulting from construction and operation of the project. Thus, this alternative would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the project. However, it would not meet any of the project objectives related to GHG emissions, because this alternative would not maximize infill redevelopment of underutilized sites in areas served by adequate infrastructure and services and that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to encourage multiple-family housing located in proximity to transit corridors.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed with a 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking. The two residential structures on-site and garage would remain in place. Since there would be no demolition of the existing on-site buildings, no impacts related to potential exposure to lead-based paint or asbestos-containing materials would occur from demolition activities. Therefore, this alternative would not include mitigation requiring abatement or removal of asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint. Thus, there would be no impact related to potential exposure of persons to hazardous materials under this alternative due to the existing structures remaining on-site.

The project impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials). The No Project Alternative would have a lesser level of hazards and hazardous materials impact compared to the project. In addition, this alternative would not meet the project objectives related to residential facilities in terms of hazardous materials exposure, as this alternative would not provide modernized residential facilities that comply with building safety codes and regulations.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed with a 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking. No new development or associated on-site stormwater improvements would be constructed. The existing trees on-site would remain in place. There would be no change related to hydrology, stormwater runoff and drainage, water quality, groundwater recharge and depletion, or flooding, as there would be no change to the existing on-site buildings, hardscape, or landscaping resulting in changes in impervious vs. pervious surfaces on-site. Thus, there would be no hydrology and water quality impacts or improvements under this alternative.

The project impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality). The No Project Alternative would have a lower level of hydrology and water quality impact compared to the project. However, this alternative would not meet the project objectives related to the infill redevelopment of underutilized sites in areas served by adequate infrastructure and services and that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to encourage multiple-family housing located in proximity to transit corridors. There are no project objectives specifically related to hydrology and water quality.

Land Use and Planning

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed with a 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking. No general plan amendment, rezoning, minor subdivision, or development plan of the site would take place. The No Project Alternative would not demolish the two residential structures and a garage located on an underutilized parcel adjacent to public transit and the project site would remain as five individual parcels. This alternative would not be consistent with the objectives of the General Plan, which focus on infill development near public transit. While the No Project Alternative would have no land use impacts, unlike the project, it would not facilitate the reuse of underutilized parcels.

The project impacts related to land use and planning would be less than significant, and the project would meet many of the objectives of the General Plan. The No Project Alternative would have a higher level of land use and planning impact compared to the project. In addition, this alternative would not meet the project objectives related to residential facilities in terms of land use and planning. This alternative would not provide housing within a nearby commercial area that provides neighborhood services that are accessible to the new residents, implement policies of importance to the County, as reflected in the General Plan, nor encourage infill redevelopment of underutilized sites in areas served by adequate infrastructure and services that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to encourage multiple-family housing located in proximity to transit corridors.

Noise

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no change in groundborne vibration and noise sources (including from traffic-related noise), as there would be no changes to the existing land uses or daily vehicle trips. Noise and vibration levels in the project vicinity would remain the same as under existing conditions. Thus, there would be no noise impacts under this alternative.

The project would result in a less than significant impact with mitigation for temporary increase in ambient noise levels during construction, less than significant impacts for noise land use compatibility and groundborne vibration, and no impact for exposure to airport noise. Compared to the project, the No Project Alternative would have no projected noise impacts. However, this alternative would not meet any of the project objectives.

Population and Housing

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed with a 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking. There would be no change related to housing and jobs and no conflict with regional population growth projections, as there would be no change to the existing on-site buildings. Thus, there would be no impact related to population under this alternative. However, this alternative would not be consistent with the objectives of the General Plan that focus on the reuse of underutilized parcels near public transit.

The project impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant and would provide 284 housing units, in support of the Contra Costa County General Plan Housing Element (see Section 3.12, Population and Housing). This Housing Element represents Contra Costa County's long-term commitment to the development and improvement of housing with specific goals for the short term, 2015-2023, and the provision of adequate and affordable housing opportunities is an important goal of the County. The No Project Alternative would not provide any housing, and would therefore have a higher level of population and housing impact compared to the project. In addition, this alternative does not meet the project objectives related to population and housing, including addressing the regional housing and employment imbalance by providing 284 housing units to an underserved area and providing much needed affordable housing through the delivery of 36 affordable units. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not provide housing within a nearby commercial area that provides neighborhood services that are accessible to the new residents or encourage infill redevelopment of underutilized sites in areas served by adequate

infrastructure and services that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to encourage multiple-family housing located in proximity to transit corridors.

Public Services

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed with a 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking. There would be no change related to fire, police, school, or library services, as there would be no change to the existing land uses on the project site.

The project impacts to public services would be less than significant (see Section 3.13, Public Services). Because the No Project Alternative would not construct new housing on the project site, the No Project Alternative would not meet the project objectives related to public services, as it would not encourage infill redevelopment of underutilized sites in areas served by adequate infrastructure and services that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to encourage multiple-family housing located in proximity to transit corridors.

Recreation

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed with a 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking, ancillary facilities, and recreational uses. The outdoor recreation area with a private swimming pool and two outdoor courtyard areas that would be available to residents and their guests would also not be developed under this alternative. There would be no change related to recreation and park services, as there would be no change related to existing land uses. Further, the permanent residential population and daytime employment population and associated demand for parks and recreational facilities would remain the same as currently exists. Thus, there would be no impact related to recreation and parks under this alternative.

The project recreation and parks impact would be less than significant with mitigation for construction-period air quality, noise, and transportation impacts (see Section 3.14, Recreation). The No Project Alternative would have a lower level of recreation and parks impact compared to the project. However, this alternative would not meet the project objectives related to residential facilities in terms of recreation and parks, as this alternative would not provide housing within a nearby commercial area that provides neighborhood recreational services that are accessible to the new residents. Furthermore, there are no project objectives related specifically to recreation.

Transportation

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed, and the 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking, ancillary facilities, and recreational uses would not be constructed on-site. The No Project Alternative would not result in additional daily vehicle trips. None of the impacts would occur and none of the mitigation measures that apply to the project would be implemented. The trips generated by the No Project Alternative are shown in Table 6-1. Study intersections under existing conditions generally operate at overall acceptable service levels in accordance with benchmarks set by the County during both the weekday morning, weekday afternoon, weekday evening, and Saturday afternoon peak-hours. Thus, there would be a less than significant impact related to transportation and traffic under the No Project Alternative.

Table 6-1: No Project Alternative Trip Generation

Scenario	Daily Trips	AM Peak-hour	PM Peak-hour
No Project Alternative ¹	20	1	2
Project	1,800	109	128
Notes: ¹ These trips are already on the roadway system and under the No Project Alternative; no net-new traffic would be generated. Source: Fehr & Peers 2019			

The project impacts to transportation and traffic would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.15, Transportation). Transportation impacts associated with the No Project Alternative would be less than those of the project. However, the No Project Alternative would not meet the project objectives related to providing needed residential development near public transit for the County. Specifically, the No Project Alternative would not meet the key project objectives of reducing traffic on area roads by increasing housing density in an area well served by regional public transportation (BART), providing housing within a nearby commercial area that provides neighborhood services that are accessible to the new residents, and encouraging infill redevelopment of underutilized sites in areas served by adequate infrastructure and services that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to encourage multiple-family housing located in proximity to transit corridors.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed, and the 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking, ancillary facilities, and recreational uses would not be constructed on-site. The two residential structures on-site would remain in place. As such, there would be no change in tribal cultural resources, as there would be no change to the existing on-site buildings and no ground disturbance. Thus, there would be no tribal cultural resources impacts under this alternative.

There would be no project impacts related to tribal cultural resources (see Section 3.16, Tribal Cultural Resources). The No Project Alternative would have a similar level of tribal cultural resources impact compared to the project. The project has no objectives specifically related to tribal cultural resources.

Utilities and Service Systems

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed, and the 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking, ancillary facilities, and recreational uses would not be constructed on-site. There would be no change related to water supply and wastewater utilities and stormwater and solid waste collection service systems, as there would be no change to the existing on-site residential buildings or associated utilities demand and infrastructure facilities. Further, this alternative would not provide modernized residential facilities on an urban infill site that would reduce overall long-term maintenance costs and promote greater efficiency in delivery of utility services. Thus, there would be no impact related to utility and service systems under this alternative.

The project impacts to utility and service systems would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.17, Utility and Service Systems). The No Project Alternative would have a lower level of utility and service systems impact compared to the project; however, this alternative would not meet the project objectives related to residential development. Furthermore, the project has no objectives specifically related to utilities and service systems.

Wildfire

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not be developed, and the 6-story podium apartment community with associated parking, ancillary facilities, and recreational uses would not be constructed on-site. No existing trees or other plants would be removed. There would be no change to the project site with regard to wildfire susceptibility. Thus, there would be no impact related to wildfire under this alternative.

The project impacts related to wildfire would be less than significant (See Section 3.18, Wildfire). The project is considered urban infill development in an area with low susceptibility to wildfire. The No Project Alternative would have a lower level of wildfire risk, as the existing residential uses would remain on-site and not add additional housing potentially exposing additional persons to wildfire risk. The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the objectives of the project. Furthermore, the project has no objectives specifically related to wildfire.

6.5.2 - Conclusion

The No Project Alternative would avoid the majority of the project's impacts by leaving the site in its existing condition, thus avoiding impacts caused by the demolition of the two residential structures and garage on-site, and the grading and construction that would occur under the project. This alternative would, in general, not exacerbate many of the identified impacts. However, by leaving the existing residences on-site instead of providing much-needed multiple-family housing near a transit station, the No Project Alternative would have greater impacts related to Population and Housing than the project. Furthermore, the No Project Alternative would not advance any of the overall project objectives.

6.6 - Alternative 2—Reduced Scale Alternative

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes (22 units per acre on 2.37 acres) would be constructed on the project site. While this alternative would reduce the overall intensity of development on the project site, it would still require the development of the entire project site. In this scenario, the number of market rate units would decrease by 82 percent (248 units down to 44 units) and the number of affordable units would decrease by 78 percent (36 units down to 8 units). Similar to the project, the two existing single-family homes and garage on the project site would be demolished. Under this alternative, surface parking would be provided rather than below ground parking.

6.6.1 - Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes would be constructed on the 2.37-acre site, including 44 market rate units and 8 affordable units. The two existing single-family homes and garage on-site would still be demolished; however, surface parking would be provided rather than below ground parking. The Reduced Scale Alternative would develop 232 fewer housing units on the project site (including 204 fewer market rate housing units and 28 fewer affordable housing units) compared to the project. There would be changes in visual character, views, nighttime lighting, and shadow, as there would be an addition of residential uses on-site that do not currently exist. Thus, there would be a less than significant with mitigation aesthetics impact with the incorporation of mitigation (MM AES-4) for light or glare impacts).

The project impacts related to aesthetics would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.1, Aesthetics). The Reduced Scale Alternative would have a similar level of aesthetics and light and glare impact compared to the project due to the inclusion of housing on-site. Additionally, this alternative would only partially meet the project objectives of addressing the regional housing and employment imbalance by providing 284 housing units to an underserved area or of providing much needed affordable housing through the delivery of 36 affordable units. The Reduced Scale Alternative would meet project objectives related to adding housing density in an area well served by regional public transportation (BART). This alternative would also meet the project objectives related to residential facilities in terms of visual character, as this alternative would create an apartment community consisting of architecture and design that encourages walkability within the neighborhood.

Air Quality

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, new criteria pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions would result from construction of the alternative and new average daily vehicle trips would be generated by the operation of the reduced-scale residential development.

The project's air quality impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. The Reduced Scale Alternative would have slightly lower operational air quality impacts compared to the project, due to a reduction in energy use and average daily trips associated with fewer residents. The Reduced Scale Alternative would also result in slightly lower construction emission impacts compared to the project; while construction would occupy the same footprint as in the project, the construction schedule would be slightly shorter for the Reduced Scale Alternative. However, similar to the project, implementation of the identified mitigation measures (MM AIR-2 and MM AIR-3) would reduce all impacts associated with this alternative to less than significant with mitigation. This alternative would not meet some of the project objectives related to air quality. While the Reduced Scale Alternative would result in fewer residents and, therefore, lower vehicle miles traveled, the lower density of this alternative compared to the project would result in fewer residents being offered access to the public transit services near the project site.

Biological Resources

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes would be constructed on the 2.37-acre site, including 44 market rate units and 8 affordable units. The two existing single-family homes and garage on-site would still be demolished; however, surface parking would be provided rather than below ground parking. The new development would be distributed throughout the site, and fewer trees would be removed, resulting in a slightly reduced impact to trees and associated habitat for birds and bats. However, similar to the proposed project, the alternative would require pre-construction surveys for special status species, as well as the preparation and implementation of a tree replacement plan and implementation of tree protection guidelines during construction. Therefore, the Reduced Scale Alternative would incorporate the same mitigation measures as the project (MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-5a, and MM BIO-5b). Thus, similar to the project, impacts to biological resources would be less than significant with mitigation under this alternative.

The project impacts related to biological resources would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.3, Biological Resources). The Reduced Scale Alternative would have a similar level of impact to biological resources compared to the project. Additionally, this alternative would not meet the project objectives of addressing the regional housing and employment imbalance by providing 284 housing units to an underserved area or of providing much needed affordable housing through the delivery of 36 affordable units. However, the Reduced Scale Alternative would meet project objectives related to adding housing density in an area well served by regional public transportation (BART), although on a lesser scale. The project does not have objectives specifically correlated to biological resources.

Cultural Resources

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes would be constructed on the 2.37-acre site, including 44 market rate units and 8 affordable units. The two existing single-family homes and garage on-site would still be demolished; however, surface parking would be provided rather than below ground parking. The Reduced Scale Alternative would have less than significant with mitigation cultural resource impacts. Similar to the project, implementation of the identified mitigation measures (MM CUL-1 and MM CUL-3) would reduce all impacts associated with this alternative to less than significant with mitigation.

The project impacts related to cultural resources would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.4, Cultural Resources). Because the alternative would be constructed on the entire site, this alternative would have a similar level of impact as the project and would incorporate the same mitigation measures as the project. This alternative would meet most of the project objectives related to residential facilities in terms of providing housing near transit, although on a lesser scale. The project does not have objectives specifically related to cultural resources.

Energy

The Reduced Scale Alternative would reduce the overall intensity of development on the project site, but would still require the development of the entire site. As such, construction of the Reduced Scale Alternative would result in similar energy impacts as the project. The reduction in number of housing units would result in slightly less energy consumption during the operation of this

alternative compared to the project, and, similar to the proposed project, there would be a less than significant impact related to energy under this alternative.

The Reduced Scale Alternative would result in lower energy consumption than the project because of a slightly shorter construction schedule, lower operational vehicle miles traveled, and lower operational electricity and natural gas usage. The Reduced Scale Alternative would satisfy the identified project objectives related to energy conservation to a lesser degree than the project. The reduced density of this alternative would partially achieve the objective of maximizing infill redevelopment of underutilized sites in areas served by adequate infrastructure and services that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to encourage multiple-family housing located in proximity to transit corridors.

Geology and Soils

The Reduced Scale Alternative would reduce the overall intensity of development on the project site, but would still require the development of the entire site. Thus, there would be potential impacts related to potential exposure of persons and property to seismic- and soil-related hazards under this alternative, as well as potential paleontological impacts. There would be less than significant impacts with mitigation under the Reduced Scale Alternative. Similar to the project, implementation of the identified mitigation measures (MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-6) would reduce all impacts associated with this alternative to less than significant with mitigation.

The project impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.6, Geology and Soils). The Reduced Scale Alternative would have a lower level of geology and soils impact compared to the project, as it would construct fewer housing units on the project site in a seismically active area. This alternative would meet the project objectives related to residential facilities in terms of providing housing near transit, although on a lesser scale. The project does not have objectives specifically related to geology and soils.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Reduced Scale Alternative would reduce the overall intensity of development on the project site, but would still require the development of the entire site. As such, construction and operation of the Reduced Scale Alternative would result in similar GHG emissions impacts as the project. However, the same mitigation for GHG emissions applied to the project would be applied to this alternative. Thus, there would be a less than significant impact with mitigation related to GHG emissions under this alternative.

The project GHG emissions impact would be less than significant with mitigation. The Reduced Scale Alternative would result in lower GHG emissions generation than the project due to a slightly shorter construction schedule and lower operational vehicle miles traveled. Similar to the project, the Reduced Scale Alternative would result in less than significant impacts with implementation of MM GHG-2. The reduced density of this alternative would partially achieve the objective of maximizing infill redevelopment of underutilized sites in areas served by adequate infrastructure and services that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to encourage multiple-family housing located in proximity to transit corridors.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes would be constructed on the 2.37-acre site, including 44 market rate units and 8 affordable units. The two existing single-family homes and garage on-site would still be demolished and surface parking would be provided rather than below ground parking. Since there would be demolition of the existing on-site buildings, impacts related to potential exposure to lead-based paint or asbestos-containing materials could occur from demolition activities. Therefore, this alternative would include mitigation requiring abatement of removal of asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint, and there would be a less than significant impact with mitigation.

The project impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials). The demolition of the existing on-site buildings would result in the same hazards and hazardous materials impacts as those that would result under the project. Therefore, this alternative would include the same mitigation as the project requiring abatement of removal of asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint (MM HAZ-1) and would result in less than significant impact with incorporation of mitigation. In addition, this alternative would meet the project objectives related to residential facilities in terms of providing housing near transit, although on a lesser scale. The project does not have objectives specifically related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Reduced Scale Alternative would reduce the overall intensity of development on the project site, but would still require the development of the entire site. The new development on the site would include on-site stormwater improvements, and some of the trees proposed for removal under the project would be removed under the Reduced Scale Alternative. The project impacts to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant with implementation of MM HYD-3 (see Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality). The Reduced Scale Alternative would result in a similar impact as the proposed project with respect to hydrology, stormwater runoff and drainage, water quality, or groundwater recharge, depletion, or flooding, as there would be residential development throughout the site. Similar to the proposed project, hydrology and water quality impacts or improvements under this alternative would be less than significant with mitigation (MM HYD-3).

This alternative would not meet the project objectives of addressing the regional housing and employment imbalance by providing 284 housing units to an underserved area or of providing much needed affordable housing through the delivery of 36 affordable units. However, the Reduced Scale Alternative would meet project objectives related to adding housing density in an area well served by regional public transportation (BART), although on a lesser scale. There are no project objectives specifically related to hydrology and water quality.

Land Use and Planning

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes would be constructed on the 2.37-acre site, including 44 market rate units and 8 affordable units. In this scenario, the number of market rate units would decrease by 82 percent (248 down to 44) and number of affordable units would decrease by 78 percent (36 down to 8). This alternative would be consistent with the objectives of

the General Plan, which focus on infill development near public transit. The Reduced Scale Alternative, like the project, would facilitate the reuse of underutilized parcels, but on a substantially lesser scale. Impacts would be less than significant under the Reduced Scale Alternative.

At 22 units per acre (52 units per 2.37 acres), this project would not comply with the Multiple-Family Residential Very High land use designation, which requires 30.0-44.9 units per acre and, similar to the proposed project, would require a General Plan Amendment. Therefore, the Reduced Scale Alternative would have a similar level of land use and planning impact compared to the project. This alternative would not meet the project objectives of addressing the regional housing and employment imbalance by providing 284 housing units to an underserved area or of providing much needed affordable housing through the delivery of 36 affordable units. However, the Reduced Scale Alternative would meet project objectives related to adding housing density in an area well served by regional public transportation (BART), although on a lesser scale.

Noise

With fewer housing units, the Reduced Scale Alternative would result in fewer operational daily vehicle trips, which would result in slightly lower traffic noise levels compared to the project. However, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would still require development of the entire project site, which would result in similar construction noise and vibration levels as well as potential conflicts with a land use plan, policy, or regulation which would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation under this alternative (MM NOI-1 and MM NOI-2).

Because of its lower density, this alternative would not satisfy the project objectives of maximizing infill development of underutilized sites in areas served by adequate infrastructure and services that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to the same degree as the project.

Population and Housing

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes would be constructed on the 2.37-acre site, including 44 market rate units and 8 affordable units. In this scenario, the number of market rate units would decrease by 82 percent (248 down to 44) and number of affordable units would decrease by 78 percent (36 down to 8). Impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant under the Reduced Scale Alternative. This alternative would be consistent with the objectives of the General Plan, which focus on infill development near public transit. Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Scale Alternative would facilitate the reuse of underutilized parcels, but on a substantially lesser scale.

The project impacts on population and housing would be less than significant and would provide 284 housing units, in support of the Contra Costa County Housing Element (see Section 3.12, Population and Housing). This Housing Element represents Contra Costa County's long-term commitment to the development and improvement of housing with specific goals for the short term, 2015-2023, and the provision of adequate and affordable housing opportunities is an important goal of the County. While the Reduced Scale Alternative would provide housing on-site, it would do so on a far lesser scale, and thus would have greater impacts with regard to population and housing, as it would provide less housing and employment overall. The Reduced Scale Alternative would not meet the

project objectives of addressing the regional housing and employment imbalance by providing 284 housing units to an underserved area or of providing much needed affordable housing through the delivery of 36 affordable units. However, the Reduced Scale Alternative would meet project objectives related to adding housing density in an area well served by regional public transportation (BART), although on a lesser scale.

Public Services

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes would be constructed on the 2.37-acre site. There would be a change in demand related to fire, police, school, or library services, as there would be an increase in housing on the project site. Impacts related to public services under the Reduced Scale Alternative would be less than significant.

The project impacts to public services would be less than significant (see Section 3.13, Public Services). The Reduced Scale Alternative would have lesser impacts than the project as it would house far fewer people on-site. The Reduced Scale Alternative would not meet the project objectives of addressing the regional housing and employment imbalance by providing 284 housing units to an underserved area or of providing much needed affordable housing through the delivery of 36 affordable units. However, the Reduced Scale Alternative would meet project objectives related to adding housing density in an area well served by regional public transportation (BART), although on a lesser scale.

Recreation

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes would be constructed on the 2.37-acre site, including 44 market rate units and 8 affordable units. The outdoor recreation area with a private swimming pool and two outdoor courtyard areas that would be available to residents and their guests would not be developed under this alternative. Impacts related to recreation under the Reduced Scale Alternative would be less than significant.

The Reduced Scale Alternative would have a lower level of recreation and parks impact compared to the project, while also meeting the majority of the project objectives related to providing housing on an underutilized site near public transit. There are no project objectives specifically related to recreation.

Transportation

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes would be constructed on the 2.37-acre site, including 44 market rate units and 8 affordable units. The two existing single-family homes and garage on-site would still be demolished; however, surface parking would be provided rather than below ground parking. The Reduced Scale Alternative would develop 232 fewer housing units on the project site (including 204 fewer market rate housing units and 28 fewer affordable housing units). The Reduced Scale alternative would generate fewer peak-hour trips during the morning and evening peak-hours than the project. As shown in Table 6-2, the Reduced Scale Alternative would generate 320 daily trips, 21 AM peak-hour, and 25 PM peak-hour.

As shown in Table 6-3, under Opening Year, the Coggins Drive at Las Juntas Way intersection is projected to operate at LOS E in the AM peak-hour under the Reduced Scale Alternative, but the Reduced Scale Alternative would not increase delay by more than 5 seconds. As such, LOS intersection

impacts would be less than significant under the Reduced Scale Alternative. As shown in Table 6-4, under Cumulative Year, the Coggins Drive at Las Juntas Way intersection is projected to operate at LOS F in the AM peak-hour under Reduced Scale Alternative, but the Reduced Scale Alternative would not increase delay by more than 5 seconds. In addition, for the PM peak-hour in the Cumulative Year, the Reduced Scale Alternative would degrade intersection operations from LOS D to LOS E, but signal warrants would not be met. As such, LOS intersection impacts would be less than significant under the Reduced Scale Alternative. Therefore, for the Reduced Scale Alternative, operational impacts related to circulation system performance in terms of roadway facilities (specifically intersection LOS) would be less severe than the proposed project, as the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts at this intersection during operation (specifically intersection LOS).

Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Scale Alternative would be required to implement MM TRANS-1a (the preparation and implementation of a construction traffic control plan), MM TRANS-1b (improvements to Las Juntas Way), MM TRANS-1c (relocation of the Del Hombre Lane crosswalk), and MM TRANS-1d (preparation of a pedestrian path design and lighting plan). Construction-period impacts would be less, given the lesser scale of development proposed under this Alternative.

Table 6-2: Reduced Scale Alternative Trip Generation

Scenario	Daily Trips	AM Peak-hour	PM Peak-hour
Reduced Scale Alternative	320	21	25
Proposed Project	1,800	109	128
Difference	(1,480)	(88)	(103)

Source: Fehr & Peers 2019

Table 6-3: Reduced Scale Alternative Opening Year without and with Project—Peak-hour Intersection Levels of Service¹

Intersection	Control ¹	Peak-hour	Opening Year without Project Condition		Opening Year with Project Condition			
			Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Signal Warrant Met?	Potentially Significant Impact?
3 Coggins Drive at Las Juntas Way	AWSC	AM	40	E	44	E	Yes	No ²
		PM	22	C	25	C	No	No

Notes:
Bold indicates operations below the intersection LOS standard for acceptable operations
Bold Italics indicates potentially significant impact.
¹ AWSC = All-way Stop Controlled; signalized = traffic signal control
² Signal warrant is met without project and project increases delay by less than 5 seconds
 Source: Fehr & Peers 2019.

¹ This table focuses on study intersection 3 under the Opening Year scenario as that is the only intersection at which the project results in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Table 6-4: Reduced Scale Alternative Cumulative Year—Peak-hour Intersection Levels of Service²

	Intersection	Control ¹	Peak-hour	Cumulative Year without Project Condition		Cumulative Year with Project Condition			
				Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Signal Warrant Met?	Potentially Significant Impact?
3	Coggins Drive at Las Juntas Way	AWSC	AM PM	56 32	F D	58 36	F E	Yes No	No No

Notes:
Bold indicates operations below the intersection LOS standard for acceptable operations
Bold Italics indicates potentially significant impact.
¹ AWSC = All-way Stop Controlled; signalized = traffic signal control
 Source: Fehr & Peers 2019.

With respect to all other study intersections, neither the proposed project nor the Reduced Scale Alternative would result in a potentially significant impact.

This alternative would meet the identified project objectives related to proposed residential uses in terms of transportation: provide needed residential development near public transit for the County, reduce traffic on area roads by increasing housing density in an area well served by regional public transportation (BART), provide housing within a nearby commercial area that provides neighborhood services that are accessible to the new residents, and encourage infill redevelopment of underutilized sites in areas served by adequate infrastructure and services that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to encourage multiple-family housing located in proximity to transit corridors. While this alternative meets these key objectives, it would meet them to a lesser degree than the proposed project.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes would be constructed on the 2.37-acre site, including 44 market rate units and 8 affordable units. The two existing single-family homes and garage on-site would still be demolished and surface parking would be provided rather than below ground parking. The Reduced Scale Alternative would develop 232 fewer housing units on the project site (including 204 fewer market rate housing units and 28 fewer affordable housing units).

The proposed project would not result in any impacts with respect to tribal cultural resources (see Section 3.16, Tribal Cultural Resources). Because the project was found to have no impact with respect to tribal cultural resources, the Reduced Scale Alternative would, similarly, have no impact to tribal cultural resources and would meet the majority of the project objectives related to providing housing on an underutilized site near public transit. There are no project objectives related specifically to tribal cultural resources.

² This table focuses on study intersection 3 under the Cumulative Year scenario as that is the only intersection at which the cumulative projects result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

Utilities and Service Systems

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes would be constructed on the 2.37-acre site. The addition of housing on-site would result in a change related to water supply demand and distribution services as well as wastewater, stormwater, and solid waste generation and collection services. Impacts to utilities and service systems under the Reduced Scale Alternative would be less than significant with mitigation. Similar to the project, the Reduced Scale Alternative would implement MM HYD-3 (see Section 3.17, Utility and Service Systems), which requires the preparation of a drainage plan prior to grading. The Reduced Scale Alternative would have a lower level of utility and service systems impact compared to the project, as it would develop fewer housing units on-site requiring utilities and service systems, while also meeting the majority of the project's objectives. The project has no objectives specifically related to utilities and service systems.

Wildfire

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, 52 townhomes would be constructed on the 2.37-acre site. The two existing single-family homes and garage on-site would still be demolished and surface parking would be provided rather than below ground parking. The Reduced Scale Alternative would develop 232 fewer housing units on the project site. While the addition of housing on the site could increase the risk for persons exposed to wildfire on the site, the site is not located in an area with high wildfire susceptibility. Thus, impacts related to wildfire would be less than significant under this alternative.

The project impacts to wildfire would be less than significant (See Section 3.18, Wildfire). The project is considered urban infill development in an area with low susceptibility to wildfire. The Reduced Scale Alternative would have a lower level of wildfire risk compared to the project, as it would develop far fewer housing units on-site while also meeting the majority of the project's objectives. Furthermore, the project has no objectives specifically related to wildfire.

6.6.2 - Conclusion

Overall, the Reduced Scale Alternative would have similar impacts to the project, as it would develop residential structures throughout the 2.37-acre site. This alternative would, in general, not exacerbate many of the identified impacts due to decreased density of development on the project site compared to the project. Because this alternative would provide substantially fewer affordable housing units, and far fewer units in general, it would have greater impacts related to Population and Housing when compared to the project. In addition, this alternative would not adequately address the housing and jobs imbalance based on the reduction of 232 total units compared to the project. The Reduced Scale Alternative would only partially fulfill the project objectives.

6.7 - Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(e)(2) requires identification of an environmentally superior alternative. If the No Project Alternative is environmentally superior, CEQA requires selection of the "environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative" from among the project and the alternatives evaluated.

To identify the environmentally superior alternative in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, Table 6-5 presents a comparison of the impacts related to the alternatives, and Table 6-6 presents a

comparison of the alternatives’ ability to meet project objectives. As shown in Table 6-5, the No Project Alternative has no impacts that would be caused by the construction and operation of the proposed project and as such would appear to be the environmentally superior alternative. However, as shown in Table 6-6, the No Project Alternative does not meet any of the project objectives. While the Reduced Scale Alternative has lesser impacts compared to the project due to a lower density of development on-site, the majority of impacts caused on the site would be similar or equal to the project due to construction proposed throughout the project site.

The Reduced Scale Alternative would avoid the proposed project’s significant unavoidable impact with respect to transportation (specifically intersection LOS). However, the Reduced Scale Alternative would meet some, but not all of the project objectives. In addition, any objective met by the Reduced Scale Alternative would be accomplished at a far lesser scale than under the proposed project. Because the Reduced Scale Alternative would not result in significant and unavoidable impacts and would still meet most project objectives, the Reduced Scale Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative.

Table 6-5: Summary of Alternatives’ Impacts

Impact	Project	Alternative 1— No Project Alternative	Alternative 2— Reduced Scale Alternative
Aesthetics	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)
Air Quality	LTSM	NI	LTSM (lesser)
Biological Resources	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)
Cultural Resources	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)
Energy	LTS	NI	LTS (lesser)
Geology and Soils	LTSM	NI	LTSM (lesser)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy	LTSM	NI	LTSM (lesser)
Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)
Hydrology and Water Quality	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)
Land Use and Planning	LTS	NI	LTS (similar)
Noise	LTSM	NI	LTSM (lesser)
Population and Housing	LTS	NI (greater)	LTS (greater)
Public Services	LTS	NI	LTS (lesser)
Recreation	LTSM	NI	LTS (lesser)
Transportation	SUM	NI	LTSM (lesser)
Tribal Cultural	NI	NI	NI (similar)
Utilities and Service Systems	LTSM	NI	LTSM (lesser)
Wildfire	LTS	NI	LTS (lesser)

Table 6-5 (cont.): Summary of Alternatives’ Impacts

Impact	Project	Alternative 1— No Project Alternative	Alternative 2— Reduced Scale Alternative
Notes: NI = No Impact LTS = less than significant LTSM = less than significant with mitigation incorporated SU = significant and unavoidable SUM = significant and unavoidable with mitigation incorporated Source: Compiled by FCS in 2019			

Table 6-6: Summary of Alternatives’ Meeting of Project Objectives

Objective	Project	Alternative 1— No Project Alternative	Alternative 2— Reduced Size Alternative
Address the regional housing and employment imbalance by providing 284 housing units to an underserved area.	All	None	Some
Reduce traffic on area roads by increasing housing density in an area well served by regional public transportation (BART).	All	None	All
Provide much needed affordable housing through the delivery of 36 affordable units.	All	None	Some
Provide housing within a nearby commercial area that provides neighborhood services that are accessible to the new residents.	All	None	All
Create an apartment community consisting of high-quality architecture that encourages walkability within the neighborhood.	All	None	All
Implement policies of importance to the County, as reflected in the General Plan.	All	None	All
Encourage infill redevelopment of underused sites in areas served by adequate infrastructure and services that are near mass transit, freeways, and urban centers to encourage multiple-family housing located in proximity to transit corridors.	All	None	Some

Table 6-6 (cont.): Summary of Alternatives’ Meeting of Project Objectives

Objective	Project	Alternative 1— No Project Alternative	Alternative 2— Reduced Size Alternative
<p>Notes: All = meets all respective identified project objectives Some = meets some respective identified project objectives None = meets no respective identified project objectives Source: Compiled by FCS in 2019</p>			

6.8 - Alternatives Considered but Rejected from Further Consideration

The following alternatives were also initially considered. However, for reasons discussed below, they were dismissed from further consideration.

6.8.1 - Zoning-compliant Alternative

Existing zoning for the project site is for single-family residential land uses. However, given the project site’s adjacency to the Pleasant Hill BART Station and location amongst multiple-family residential uses, it would not be a compatible use to develop single-family uses on the project site when multiple-family uses are more appropriate for transit-oriented development purposes and goals.

6.8.2 - Alternate Location(s) Alternative

Given the project site adjacency to the Pleasant Hill BART Station and location amongst existing multiple-family residential uses, an alternative location to the project site for the project would not be conducive to meeting transit-oriented development purposes and goals. The CEQA Guidelines encourage consideration of an alternative location when significant effects of a project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project at another location (CEQA Guidelines § 15126(f)(2)(A)). An alternative location would need to be at least of comparable size within the urbanized area of Contra Costa County and have adequate roadway access, utility capacity, and proximity to transit. In order to identify an alternative location that might be reasonably considered to “feasibly accomplish most of the basic purposes” of the project and also reduce significant impacts, it was assumed that such a location would ideally have the following characteristics:

- At least 2.5 acres in size;
- Located within 0.25 mile of transit stop or station;
- Served by available infrastructure;
- Available for purchase and development; and
- Zoned for residential development at a density similar to what would be permitted at the project site.

Potential alternative locations were evaluated that would (1) reduce or avoid some or all of the environmental impacts of the project, (2) be of sufficient size to meet most of the basic project objectives, and (3) be immediately available to be acquired or controlled by the applicant.

A suitably sized development location within Contra Costa County could be expected to have transportation impacts, as well as impacts associated with construction. Any project of this size and intensity is likely to result in the same or similar impacts on roadways, some perhaps more significant. Therefore, because no suitable alternative location is available that could meet the basic objectives of the project, an off-site alternative is not feasible.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK