5 ALTERNATIVES

The Draft 2030 General Plan was described and analyzed in the previous sections with an emphasis on potentially significant impacts and the recommended goals, policies, and actions in the proposed Plan itself which avoid those impacts. The CEQA Guidelines also require the description and comparative analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project (e.g., the Draft 2030 General Plan) that could feasibly attain the objectives of the project while avoiding or reducing the impacts associated with the preferred alternative.

The following discussion is intended to inform the public and decision makers of feasible alternatives to the Draft 2030 General Plan. Section 15126.6 of the CEQA guidelines states that:

> *An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation.*

A No Project Alternative is required as one of the "reasonable range of alternatives" that could feasibly attain most or all of the project's objectives. Each alternative is analyzed against the significance thresholds considered in Chapter 4. The alternatives to the Plan are:

1. **No Project Alternative - Retention of the Danville 2010 General Plan.** Under this alternative, the Draft 2030 General Plan would not be adopted and future development in Danville and its sphere of influence (SOI) would be subject to existing policies, regulations, and land use designations as set forth by the existing Danville 2010 General Plan. For the portion of the Danville Planning Area lying beyond the SOI, future development would be subject to existing policies, regulations, and land use designations as set forth by the existing Contra Costa

County General Plan. This is the CEQA-mandated No Project Alternative

2. **Reduced Housing Increase Alternative.** Under this alternative, land use re-designations to allow new Residential – Multifamily – High Density (25-35 du/acre) and Residential – Multifamily – High/Medium Density (20-25 du/acre) development would be more limited than proposed in the Draft 2030 General Plan. Under this alternative, Danville would re-designate enough land for multiple family use to meet the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) shortfall identified in the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element (i.e., a minimum of 7.8 acres of Residential – Multifamily – High Density and a minimum of 1.7 acres of Residential – Multifamily – High/Medium). The land under consideration for re-designation under this alternative may also be adequate to meet the anticipated RHNA requirement from the upcoming 2014-2021 Housing Element planning period. The preliminary RHNA release by ABAG for the 2014-2021 planning period places Danville's housing obligation at 583 units as of March 2012 – inclusive of 299 very low- and low-income units that would dictate the provision of an additional 6.3+/- acres of Residential – Multifamily – High Density and 4.4+/- acres Residential – Multifamily – High/Medium Density lands.

   Under this alternative several Housing Opportunity Sites (HOS) would be eliminated from consideration, and these sites would instead develop under their present, 2010 General Plan land use designations. The HOS properties eliminated from consideration would include: the southerly one acre portion of H-3; sites H-17, H-18, H-19, and H-27 (collectively being the Downtown sites in proximity to Diablo Road); along with H-23 (south end of Downtown along San Ramon Valley Blvd.); and H-26 (between Fostoria Way and El Capitan).

A comparison of the build-out figures for the Draft 2030 General Plan and each alternative is provided in Table 5-1, below. A comparison of potential impacts of each alternative to those of the 2030 Plan is provided in Table 5-2, below.

A. No Project Alternative - Retention of the Danville 2010 General Plan

1. Principal Characteristics

Under the **No Project Alternative - Retention of the Danville 2010 General Plan**, the Draft 2030 General Plan would not be adopted, and future development in Danville and its Planning Area would occur as set forth under the existing Danville 2010 General Plan land use designations and policy direction (and per the County General Plan for the unincorporated portion of the Planning Area). Per the build-out projections presented in Table 5-1, there would be an estimated 44,330 residents within the Town limit, compared to 46,810 if the Draft 2030 General Plan were adopted. There would be 51,120 residents in Danville + SOI + Planning Area compared to 53,600 if the Draft 2030 General Plan were adopted. These differences are a consequence of the loss of approximately 910 potential households projected to be developed upon the HOS properties if they secured land use re-designations proposed in the Draft 2030 General Plan.

TABLE 5-1 **HOUSEHOLD/POPULATION/EMPLOYMENT ESTIMATES FOR BUILD-OUT OF DRAFT 2030 GENERAL PLAN AND ALTERNATIVES**

		Project Draft 2030 General Plan		Project Alternatives: No Project – 2010 General Plan		Project Alternatives: Reduced Housing Increase	
	2010	Number in 2030	% Incr. from 2010	Number in 2030	% Incr. from 2010	Number in 2030	% Incr. from '2010
Households[a]							
Town	15,420	17,060	10.6	16,150	4.7	16,600	7.6
Planning Area	17,240	19,490	13.1	18,580	7.7	19,030	10.4
Residents [a,b]							
Town	42,040	46,810	11.3	44,330	5.4	45,560	8.4
Planning Area	47,130	53,600	13.7	51,120	8.5	52,310	11.0
Jobs							
Town	14,910	16,300	9.3	17,200	15.3	17,000	14.0
Planning Area	15,260	16,700	9.4	17,600	15.3	17,400	14.0

[a] 2010 household and resident figures based on 2010 Census.
[b] 2030 population figures derived by 2.73 persons per household assumption (based on projected mix of unit types) plus group quarters population (presumed constant from 2010 to 2030)

Conversely, under the Existing General Plan, there would be an estimated 17,200 jobs within the Town limit, compared to 16,300 if the 2030 General Plan were adopted; and there would be 17,600 jobs in the Planning Area compared to 16,700 if the 2030 General Plan were adopted. This reflects use of several HOS for residential uses rather than commercial development, and the removal of several office buildings.

TABLE 5-2 **COMPARISON OF IMPACTS FROM PROJECT ALTERNATIVES COMPARED TO PROPOSED PROJECT**

Topic	No Project Alternative Existing 2010 General Plan	Reduced Housing Alternative
Aesthetics	=	=
Agriculture and Forestry Resources	=	=
Air Quality	-	-
Biological Resources	-	=
Cultural and Historic Resources	=	=
Geology and Soils	-	=
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	- -	-
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	-	=
Hydrology and Water Quality	=	=
Land Use and Planning	- -	-
Noise	-	=
Population and Housing	- -	-
Public Services	+	+
Transportation and Traffic	+	+
Utilities and Service Systems	=	=

++ Substantial improvement compared to the Proposed Project.
+ Slight improvement compared to the Proposed Project.
= Equivalent to the Proposed Project.
- Slight deterioration compared to the Proposed Project
-- Substantial deterioration compared to the Proposed Project

TABLE 5-3 **COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES TO OBJECTIVES**

		Alternative		
#	Objective	2030 GP	No Project	Reduced Density
1	Maintain and reinforce the small town way of life enjoyed by Danville residents, and to preserve the present aesthetics and other community qualities.	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Protect the quality of life within existing development areas of the community.	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Allow orderly and appropriate growth coupled with the maintenance of high-quality public facilities and services.	Yes	Yes, but less than project	Yes, but less than project
4	Achieve harmony between Danville's development and its physical setting by protecting natural resources, avoiding development of hazardous areas, and preserving critical open space areas	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Facilitate the development of a variety of housing types in a manner that is consistent with State law and addressing regional housing needs.	Yes	No	Yes, but only in short term

Source: The Planning Center | DC&E, 2011.

Under the No Project Alternative - Retention of the Danville 2010 General Plan) current goals and policies would be maintained without the addition of new goals or policies. Under the Proposed Project (i.e., implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan), in addition to maintaining the bulk of existing goals and policies, new goals and policies would be adopted and implemented.

2. Impact Discussion

a. Aesthetics

Under either the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) or the No Project Alternative - Retention of the Danville 2010 General Plan), the geographic extent of allowed development would be the same. Policies 1.01 and 1.02, relating to the preservation of Danville's predominantly single-family residen-

tial nature, Downtown core, and existing character, are found in both the 2010 General Plan and the Draft 2030 General Plan. Policies 2.01 and 2.02 are likewise found in both plans and would continue to require high-quality design and the preservation of scenic resources, such as hillsides, ridgelines, trees, and riparian areas. Whether under the Proposed Project or the No Project Alternative, the continuation or strengthening of these and other policies would serve to prevent significant visual impacts. Therefore, the impact on aesthetic resources from implementation of the 2010 General Plan under the No Project Alternative would be *equivalent* to the Proposed Project.

b. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Danville has no commercial forestry resources. There would be no difference between the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and the No Project Alternative in terms of allowed development areas on or adjacent to forestlands or agriculturally sensitive lands. Additionally, both the Proposed Project and the No Project Alternative would continue policies supporting the long-term economic viability of agriculture in the region by encouraging "right-to-farm" ordinances and buffering of uses. Therefore, the impacts on agricultural and forest resources from the continuation of the 2010 General Plan under the No Project Alternative would be *equivalent* to the Proposed Project.

c. Air Quality

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be fewer additional housing units built in Danville; however, continuation of the 2010 General Plan under the No Project Alternative could allow for higher levels of commercial development and the creation of more jobs than would be anticipated under the Draft 2030 General Plan. Data from traffic models forecasted a less than one percent difference between 2030 Town-wide traffic volumes for the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and the No Project Alternative.[1] Both the Project and the No Project Alternative would only permit new residential, retail, or office uses, none of which are typically associated with significant

[1] Fehr & Peers, 2011. Traffic Modeling for Danville Draft 2030 General Plan.

potential for large-scale, point-source air pollution, and both plans would allow generally similar amounts of construction. Additionally, both the Proposed Project and the No Project Alternative would continue Goal 24 for the reduction of air pollution, and would maintain and enhance multiple additional policies that support of this goal. Under either plan, Danville would remain subject to regional, State, and federal regulations pertaining to air quality. Under both the No Project Alternative and the Draft 2030 General Plan, it is anticipated that one significant impact would occur from increases in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) outpacing increases to population (i.e., more VMT per capita). However, under the Draft 2030 General Plan, the increase to VMT would be lower relative to population growth than under the No Project Alternative. Therefore, impacts on air quality from the No Project Alternative are *greater* than those of the Proposed Project and the No Project Alternative thus represents a *slight deterioration* from the Proposed Project.

d. Biological Resources

Under both the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and the No Project Alternative, areas of park, wilderness, and open space would continue to be preserved. The areal extent of allowed development would be the same under the Proposed Project or the No Project Alternative, and both the current 2010 General Plan and the Draft 2030 General Plan include protections for natural resources, open spaces, and wild lands. Policy 18.01, which seeks to preserve and enhance natural areas, would be maintained and strengthened. Additionally, new policies 18.10, 18.11, and 18.12 under the Draft 2030 General Plan would require detailed pre-development biological surveys, protect active bird nests, and encourage sharing of biological resource information. Due to the additional policies addressing biological resources, the Draft 2030 General Plan provides a higher degree of awareness of the need to protect resources. Therefore the No Project Alternative is a *slight deterioration* compared to the Proposed Project.

e. Cultural Resources

Under both the Draft 2030 General Plan and the No Project Alternative, the areal extent of allowed development would be the same, making it unlikely

that either would have a disproportionately large impact on known or undiscovered cultural resources. Both the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and No Project Alternative would continue Goal 8 of preserving and Proposed Project promoting Danville's cultural resources, with policies that seek to protect and restore historic and archaeological sites. Cultural resources would also continue to be protected under State and federal regulation, and the Danville Municipal Code. Therefore impacts on cultural resources from the No Project Alternative are *equivalent* to those of the Proposed Project.

f. Geology and Soils

Under the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) or the No Project Alternative, the areal extent of allowed development would be the same, and either plan would include the continuation or enhancement of current Town restrictions on construction on hillsides, or in other sensitive or unstable areas. Specifically, the continuation of the 2010 General Plan or the implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan would maintain Goal 20, which seeks to "minimize the risks to lives and property due to earthquakes, landslides, and associated geologic activity." Supporting policies 20.01 through 20.05 would continue to: mandate incorporation of earthquake protection measures; restrict the placement of critical infrastructure; prohibit development in steep areas; and require geology and soil reports for projects in at-risk areas. Additionally, a new policy under Goal 20 in the Draft 2030 General Plan would require geotechnical reports for occupied structures within the Alquist-Priolo zone. Without the strengthened measures under the Draft 2030 General Plan, the continuation of the Existing 2010 General Plan under the No Project Alternative would cause increased impacts on geology and soils and would therefore be a *slight deterioration* compared to those of the proposed project.

g. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under the No Project Alternative, the lower number of eventual residents in Danville would not lead to lower total GHG emissions from Danville's population because in this alternative the Town would not adopt the GHG reduc-

tion policies in the Sustainability Action Plan. Additionally, increased potential for commercial activity would cancel out a portion of any reductions due to lower total residents. Under the No Project Alternative, residential development and associated GHG emissions are likely to be transferred to other areas, rather than eliminated. Since greenhouse gas emissions are an inherently cumulative impact, this would not represent an improvement. Moreover, reduced housing availability in portions of Danville that are close to retail, employment, and transit opportunities would result in greater over all automobile dependency and subsequent GHG emissions, both in Danville and the region. Therefore, the impacts on GHG emissions of the No Project alternative would be *greater* than those of the Proposed Project and thus represent a *substantial deterioration* compared to the Proposed Project.

h. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Neither the No Project Alternative nor the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) include land use changes that would permit new hazardous materials uses. Under the No Project Alternative, future development would remain subject to State and/or local regulations pertaining to seismic zones, hillsides or steeply-sloped areas, fire risk, flood zones, and other hazards. The implementation of the 2030 General Plan under the Proposed Project, however, would include several new policies relating to hazardous materials and their disposal. These policies would include measures to reduce and better dispose of hazardous waste; require pre-development evaluation of onsite hazardous materials risks; support regional plans and policies related to hazardous materials; and incorporate abatement requirements into development agreements. The continuation of the 2010 General Plan under the No Project Alternative would not implement these policies. Therefore the impacts on hazards and hazardous materials from the No Project Alternative are *greater* than those of the Proposed Project and thus potentially represent a *minor deterioration* compared to the Proposed Project.

i. Hydrology and Water Quality

Under both the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and the No Project Alternative, hydrology and water quality would continue to be governed

by extensive local, regional, State, and federal regulations. At the local level, Danville's requirements and policies regarding stormwater, grading, and protection of natural areas, among others, would serve to prevent significant impacts from existing or planned development. The Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and the Contra Costa Clean Water Program would continue to administer programs, permits, and regulations which serve to mitigate or reduce stormwater runoff, prevent pollution, and avoid the need for new flood-control structures. State requirements overseen by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and Federal requirements under the Clean Water act would continue regulation and permitting for pollution and stormwater. With the continuation of these existing policies and regulations, impacts on hydrology and water quality from the No Project Alternative would be *equivalent* to those under the Proposed Project.

j. Land Use and Planning

Under the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) or the No Project Alternative, the areal extent of allowed development would be the same, and no planned land uses would cause physical division of the community, or create or exacerbate a conflict between land uses. Continuation of the 2010 General Plan under the No Project Alternative would not conflict with a habitat or natural community conservation plan; however, protections for natural habitats and communities would be stronger under the Proposed Project. The No Project Alternative would, however, potentially conflict with land use plans and policies of both the region and State that are intended to lessen environmental impacts. Under AB32 and SB375, communities are required to create Sustainable Communities Strategies and pursue land use strategies which reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and improve sustainability. Under the No Project Alternative and with no significant future modifications to Danville's land use categories, the land use re-designations necessary to increase residential density near jobs and services in the Town core, would not occur. This would be inconsistent with goals and policies at the state and regional levels. Therefore, the impacts on land use and planning under the No Project Alternative would likely be *greater* than those under the Proposed Project,

and would thus represent a *substantial deterioration* as compared to the Proposed Project.

k. Noise

Under both the Draft 2030 General Plan and the No Project Alternative, the areal extent of allowed development would be the same, and neither the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) nor the No Project Alternative would allow new uses associated with excessive generation of noise. The vast majority of noise associated with the mixed-use, commercial, or residential uses allowed by either the Proposed Project or the No Project Alternative would emanate from resulting vehicular traffic. Implementation of either the Proposed Project or No Project Alternative would potentially result in significant noise impacts; however with the implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan and associated mitigations, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, the impacts on noise under the No Project Alternative would be *greater* than those under the Proposed Project and thus represent a *slight deterioration* compared to the Proposed Project.

l. Population and Housing

Under the No Project Alternative, re-designation of the Housing Opportunity Sites (HOS)to allow new Residential – Multifamily – High Density (25-35 du/acre) and Residential – Multifamily – High/Medium Density (20-25 du/acre) development would not occur. Danville would have a decreased capacity to provide new housing, especially housing at the minimum development densities assumed necessary to serve very low- or low-income households. Without re-designation of land for multiple family use, Danville would retain a greater capacity for commercial, retail and job growth. Though Danville would experience lessened population growth and attendant impacts under the No Project Alternative, Danville would still experience at great deal of the amount of growth envisioned under the Draft Danville 2030 General Plan, but the growth would be void of most of the opportunities for higher density multiple family development. There would be a significantly reduced amount of housing opportunities, resulting in a larger impact to housing availability—especially in regard to lower income households.

Therefore, under the No Project Alternative, impacts to population and housing would be *greater* than those under the Proposed Project and thus represent a *substantial deterioration* compared to the Proposed Project.

m. Public Services and Recreation

Under the No Project Alternative, re-designation of the Housing Opportunity Sites (HOS)to allow new Residential – Multifamily – High Density (25-35 du/acre) and Residential – Multifamily – High/Medium Density (20-25 du/acre) development would not occur and Danville would likely experience diminished population growth. Though there would likely be increased capacity for commercial, retail and job growth as a result of land not being converted from commercial to residential land use designation, such uses generate considerably less demand for public services and recreation facilities. Therefore, the impacts of the No Project Alternative on public services and recreation would be *less* than those of the Proposed Project and thus represent a *slight improvement* over the Proposed Project.

n. Transportation/Traffic

Under either the No Project Alternative or the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) Danville would experience an increase in traffic volume. Changes in Danville traffic levels are primarily the result of regional growth and roadway congestion, and as discussed in the Traffic and Transportation section, neither the No Project Alternative nor the Proposed Project would result in significant project-level impacts. Under the No Project Alternative, regional growth would still occur, and there would probably still be some contribution from growth in Danville. However, the impacts of the No Project Alternative on transportation and traffic would be *less* than those of the Proposed Project and thus represent a *slight improvement* compared to the Proposed Project.

o. Utilities & Service Systems

Under the No Project Alternative, re-designation of the Housing Opportunity Sites (HOS)to allow new Residential – Multifamily – High Density (25-35 du/acre) and Residential – Multifamily – High/Medium Density (20-25

du/acre) development would not occur and Danville would likely experience diminished population growth. There would likely be increased capacity for commercial, retail and job growth as a result of land not being converted from commercial to residential land use designation. The demands placed upon utilities and service systems by these uses would depend highly upon exactly what type of commercial or retail establishments were developed. Industrial or manufacturing uses that have high utility demands would not be newly allowed. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that demands on these systems would not greatly differ between the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and the No Project Alternative. Therefore, the impacts on utilities and service systems under the No Project Alternative would be *equivalent* to those under the Proposed Project.

3. Feasibility and Comparison to Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative - Retention of the Danville 2010 General Plan would satisfy project objectives 1, 2, and 4, relating to Danville's character, quality of life, and physical setting. Both the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and the No Project alternative would continue existing policies affecting the attainment of these objectives, and proposed land use designations under the Draft 2030 General Plan would not detract from their attainment. The No Project Alternative, however, would at best only partially satisfy Objective 3 relating to allowing orderly and appropriate growth. Since the No Project Alternative would forgo land use re-designations to allow higher density housing on key opportunity sites, it would diminish Danville's capacity for residential growth and ability to provide affordable, multi-family housing. By failing to provide a variety of housing types per regional and State requirements, the No Project Alternative would not meet Objective 5.

B. Reduced Density Alternative

1. Principal Characteristics

Under this alternative, land use re-designations to allow new Residential – Multifamily – High Density (25-35 du/acre) and Residential – Multifamily –

High/Medium Density (20-25 du/acre) development would be more limited than in the Draft 2030 General Plan. Under this alternative, Danville would still re-designate enough land for multiple family use to meet the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) shortfall identified in the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element (i.e., a minimum of 7.8 acres of Residential – Multi-family – High Density and a minimum of 1.7 acres of Residential – Multifamily – High/Medium). The land under consideration for re-designation under this alternative may also be adequate to meet the anticipated RHNA requirement from the upcoming 2014-2021 Housing Element planning period.

Table 5-4 (overleaf) shows the Housing Opportunity Sites (HOS) that would not be removed from consideration as HOS and be developed as per their land use designations in the Danville 2010 General Plan. Under this Alternative, the four sites in the Diablo Road corridor (H-17, 18, 19, 27) would not develop with the highest density residential land uses. The three single-family lots on Elsie Lane (H-3 b,d,f), would remain as Low Density Residential. One of the South End of Downtown Sites, the parking lot behind the medical offices on San Ramon Valley Boulevard and the adjoining older residential parcels, would retain its current General Plan designations. Lastly, the Crow Canyon Executive Park (H-26) designation would be changed to Limited Office instead of Mixed Use, or remain as Controlled Manufacturing.

This would accommodate roughly 450 households *more* than the 2010 General Plan and 460 households *less* than the Draft 2030 General Plan. This alternative still meets the commitment made to the California Department of Housing and Community Development by the Housing Element and includes a small amount of additional capacity to meet a probable future RHNA assignment. The RHNA obligation is to provide eight acres zoned to allow at least 25 units per acre and two acres zoned to allow at least 20 units per acre.

2. Impact Discussion

a. Aesthetics

Under either the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) or the Reduced

Housing Alternative, the areal extent of allowed development would remain the same. Policies 1.01 and 1.02, relating to the preservation of Danville's single-family nature, Downtown core, and existing character, would be implemented under either the Reduced Housing alternative or the Draft 2030 General Plan. Policies 2.01 and 2.02 would likewise remain under both plans and would continue to require high-quality design and the preservation of scenic resources, such as hillsides, ridgelines, trees, and riparian areas. Whether under the Proposed Project or this alternative, the continuation or strengthening of these and other policies would serve to prevent significant visual impacts. Therefore, the impacts on aesthetic resources from implementation of the Reduced Housing Alternative would be *equivalent* to those of the Proposed Project.

b. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Danville has no commercial forestry resources. There would be no difference between the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and the Reduced Housing Alternative in terms of allowed development areas on or adjacent to forestlands or agriculturally sensitive lands. Additionally, both the Proposed Project and the Reduced Housing Alternative would continue policies supporting the long-term economical viability of agriculture in the region by encouraging "right-to-farm" ordinances and buffering of uses. Therefore, the impacts on agricultural and forest resources from the implementation of the Reduced Housing Alternative would be *equivalent* to those under the Proposed Project.

c. Air Quality

Under the Reduced Housing Alternative, there would be fewer additional housing units built in Danville; however, permitted non-residential development on particular sites could allow for additional commercial uses and the creation of more jobs than would be anticipated under the Draft 2030 General Plan. Data from traffic models forecasted a less than one percent difference

TABLE 5-4 **REVISED HOUSING OPPORTUNITY SITES SUMMARY**

			Draft 2030 General Plan		Reduced Housing Alternative		
Site	2010 Plan Designation	2030 Plan Designation (Units/Acre)	Potential Housing Yield (Units)	Estimated Office/ Retail Yield (Change/SF)	Potential Housing Yield (Units)	Estimated Office/ Retail Yield (Change/SF)	Comments
Diablo Road Sites							
H-17	R-MF – Low Density	R-MF-HD (25-30 u/ac)	37	0	0	0	No change from current use of structures is presumed.
H-18	DBD 6 – Offices	R-MF-HD (25-30 u/ac)	30	0	0	0	Site is re-designated from office to housing, but no change from current use or structures (which is already residential) is presumed.
H-19	DBD 6 – Offices	R-MF-HD (25-30 u/ac)	176	Minus 24,200	0	0	No change from current use is presumed. It is possible that site would redevelop with more intense office uses as existing FAR is low.
H-27	DBD 6 – Offices	R-MF-HD (25-30 u/ac)	124	Minus 46,600	0	0	No change from current use or structures is presumed. Existing offices remain.
North Hartz Sites							
H-6	DBD 4 – Residential Serving Commercial (RSC)	DBD 11 – Special Opportunity Sites (SOS)	18	Plus 6,000 retail and 9,000 offices	18	15,000	Same as project
H-7	DBD 4 – RSC	DBD 11 – SOS	25	Plus 10,500= retail-restaurant and 10,400 office	25	24,500	Same as project
H-8a-f	DBD 4 – RSC	DBD 11 – SOS	23	Plus 17,000 retail-restaurant plus 11,000 office	23	28,000	Same as project
H-8g-j	DBD 4 – RSC	DBD 11 – SOS	23	Plus 17,000 retail-restaurant plus 11,000 office	23	28,000	Same as project
West Pintado Sites							
H-3e	Mixed Use	R-MF-HD (25-30 units/acre)	55	0	55	0	Same as project
H-3b,d,f	R-Single Family Low Density (1-3 DU/AC)	R-MF-High/Med. Density (20-25 u/ac)	20	0	0	0	3 houses remain

TABLE 5-4 **REVISED HOUSING OPPORTUNITY SITES SUMMARY** (CONTINUED)

			Draft 2030 General Plan		Reduced Housing Alternative		
Site	2010 Plan Designation	2030 Plan Designation (Units/Acre)	Potential Housing Yield (Units)	Estimated Office/ Retail Yield (Change/SF)	Potential Housing Yield (Units)	Estimated Office/ Retail Yield (Change/SF)	Comments
South End of Downtown Sites							
H-11	DBD 4 - Residential Serving Commercial	DBD 11 – Special Opportunity Sites	14	Plus 14,500 retail-restaurant and 12,800 office	14	27,300	Same as project
H-21	DBD 7 – Retail	R-MF-HD (25-30 units/acre)	60	Minus 40,700 (bowling removed)	60	Minus 40,700	Same as project
H-23	Commercial – Limited Office (pt)/R-MF Low/ Medium Density	R-MF-H/MD (20-25 units/acre)	30	0	0	0	No change from current use or structures presumed. Continues to be office building parking lot with some under-used residential lots.
El Cerro Site (Darby)							
H-12	Commercial – Limited Office	R-MF-H/MD (20-25 u/ac)	55	Minus 5,000 commercial to be removed	55	0	Same as project
Borel Site							
H-24a	R - Single Family - Medium (3-5 DU/AC)	R-MF-H/MD (20-25 u/ac)	50	0	50	0	Same as project
H-24b	R - Single Family - Medium (3-5 DU/AC) and Commercial	R-MF-HD (25-30 u/ac)	175	0	175	0	Same as project
Fostoria Way Site							
H-26	Commercial/ Controlled Manufacturing	Mixed Use	50-75 in mixed use project	9,600 light industrial to be removed. Reuse could include office/retail instead, or in addition to, housing.	0	0	Changed to limited office designation to match current use. No housing presumed.

Notes: R = Residential; SF = square feet.
HOS site numbering system is as per the Housing Opportunity Sites Reference Guide, February 15, 2011.

between 2030 Town-wide traffic volumes for the project and the No Project Alternative, which would exclude higher residential development from all Housing Opportunity sites. Since the amount of potential residential and commercial development under the Reduced Housing Alternative would fall between that of the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and the No Project Alternative, it is not anticipated that the Reduced Housing Alternative would generate significantly more or less traffic than either of the other alternatives. Both the project and the Reduced Housing Alternative would only permit new residential, retail, or office uses, none of which are typically associated with significant potential for large-scale, point-source air pollution, and both plans would allow generally similar amounts of construction. Additionally, both the Proposed Project and the Reduced Housing Alternative would continue Goal 24 for the reduction of air pollution, and would maintain and enhance the policies that support of this goal. Under either plan, Danville would remain subject to regional, State, and federal regulations pertaining to air quality. Under both the Reduced Density Alternative and the Draft 2030 General Plan, it is anticipated that one significant impact would occur from increases in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) outpacing increases to population (i.e., more VMT per capita). However, under the Draft 2030 General Plan, the increase to VMT would be lower relative to population growth than under the Reduced Density Alternative. Therefore, impacts on air quality from the Reduced Density Alternative are *greater* than those of the Proposed Project and the Reduced Density Alternative thus represents a *slight deterioration* from the Proposed Project.

d. Biological Resources

Under both the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and the Reduced Housing Alternative, areas of park, wilderness, and open space would continue to be preserved. The areal extent of allowed development would be the same under the Proposed Project or the Reduced Housing Alternative, and both plans would include protections for natural resources, open spaces, and wild lands. **Policy 18.01**, which seeks to preserve and enhance natural areas, would be maintained and strengthened under either the Proposed Project or this alternative. Additionally, new policies 18.10, 18.11, and 18.12 proposed

under both plans would require detailed pre-development biological surveys, protect active bird nests, and encourage sharing of biological resource information, thus mitigating potential impacts from newly allowed development. Therefore, impacts on biological resources from the Reduced Housing Alternative are *equivalent* to those of the Proposed Project.

e. Cultural Resources

Under both the Draft 2030 General Plan and the Reduced Housing Alternative, the areal extent of allowed development would be the same, making it unlikely that either would have a disproportionately large impact on known or undiscovered cultural resources. Both the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and the Reduced Housing Alternative would continue Goal 8 of preserving and promoting Danville's cultural resources, with policies that seek to protect and restore historic and archaeological sites. Cultural resources would also continue to be protected under State and federal regulation, and the Danville Municipal Code. Therefore impacts on cultural resources from the Reduced Housing Alternative are *equivalent* to those of the Proposed Project.

f. Geology and Soils

Under the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) or the Reduced Housing Alternative, the areal extent of allowed development would be the same, and either plan would include the continuation and enhancement of current Town restrictions on construction on hillsides, or in other sensitive or unstable areas. Specifically, both would maintain Goal 20, which seeks to "minimize the risks to lives and property due to earthquakes, landslides, and associated geologic activity." Supporting policies 20.01 through 20.05 would continue to: mandate incorporation of earthquake protection measures; restrict the placement of critical infrastructure; prohibit development in steep areas; and require geology and soil reports for projects in at-risk areas. Additionally, a new policy under Goal 20 under both this alternative and the Proposed Project would require geotechnical reports for occupied structures within the Alquist-Priolo zone. Therefore, with these continued and strengthened

measures, the impacts on geology and soils from the Reduced Housing Alternative would be *equivalent* to those of the Proposed Project.

g. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under the Reduced Housing Alternative, the lower number of eventual residents in Danville would lead to lower total GHG emissions from Danville's population in conjunction with the adoption of GHG reduction measures in the Sustainability Action Plan. However, increased potential for commercial activity would cancel out a portion of these reductions from decreased residential population. Under the Reduced Housing Alternative, residential development and associated GHG emissions are likely to be transferred to other areas, rather than eliminated. Since greenhouse gas emissions are an inherently cumulative impact, this would not represent an improvement. Moreover, reduced housing availability in portions of Danville that are close to retail, employment, and transit opportunities would result in greater over all automobile dependency and subsequent GHG emissions, both in Danville and the region. Therefore, the impacts on GHG emissions of the Reduced Housing Alternative would be *greater* than those of the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and thus represent a *slight deterioration* compared to the Proposed Project.

h. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Neither the Reduced Housing Alternative nor the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) include land use changes that would permit new hazardous materials uses. Under the Reduced Housing Alternative, potential developments would remain subject to State and/or local regulations pertaining to seismic zones, hillsides or steeply-sloped areas, fire risk, flood zones, and other hazards. Implementation of this alternative or the Proposed Project would include several new policies relating to hazardous materials and their disposal. These policies would both include measures to reduce and better dispose of hazardous waste; require pre-development evaluation of onsite hazardous materials risks; support regional plans and policies related to hazardous materials; and incorporate abatement requirements into development agreements.

Therefore the impacts on hazards and hazardous materials from the Reduced Housing Alternative are *equivalent* to those of the Proposed Project.

i. Hydrology and Water Quality

Under both the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) and the Reduced Housing Alternative, hydrology and water quality would continue to be governed by extensive local, regional, State, and federal regulations. At the local level, Danville's requirements and policies regarding stormwater, grading, and protection of natural areas, among others, would serve to prevent significant impacts from existing or planned development. The Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and the Contra Costa Clean Water Program would continue to administer programs, permits, and regulations which serve to mitigate or reduce stormwater runoff, prevent pollution, and avoid the need for new flood-control structures. State requirements overseen by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and Federal requirements under the Clean Water act would continue regulation and permitting for pollution and stormwater. With the continuation of these existing policies and regulations, impacts on hydrology and water quality from the Reduced Housing Alternative would be *equivalent* to those under the Proposed Project.

j. Land Use and Planning

Under the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) or the Reduced Housing Alternative, the areal extent of allowed development would be the same, and no planned land uses would cause physical division of the community, or create or exacerbate a conflict between land uses. Neither the Proposed Project nor the Reduced Housing Alternative would conflict with a habitat or natural community conservation plan, and protections for natural habitats and communities would be stronger under either option. The Reduced Housing Alternative would, however, potentially conflict, in small part, with land use plans and policies of both the region and State that are intended to lessen environmental impacts. Under AB32 and SB375, communities are required to create Sustainable Com-munities Strategies and pursue land use strategies which reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and improve sustainability. Under the Reduced Housing Alternative and with no additional,

future modifications to Danville's land use categories, re-designations necessary to increase residential density near jobs and services in the Town core would be more limited. This would be less consistent with goals and policies at the state and regional levels than the Proposed Project. Therefore, the impacts on land use and planning under the Reduced Housing Alternative would likely be *greater* than those under the Proposed Project, and would thus represent a *slight deterioration* compared to the Proposed Project.

k. Noise

Under both the Draft 2030 General Plan and the Reduced Housing Alternative, the areal extent of allowed development would be the same, and neither the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan) nor this alternative would allow new uses associated with excessive generation of noise. The vast majority of noise associated with the mixed-use, commercial, or residential uses allowed by either the Proposed Project or the Reduced Housing Alternative would emanate from resulting vehicular traffic. Both the Proposed Project and the Reduced Housing Alternative would create significant noise impacts; however, under either alternative mitigations would reduce these impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the impacts on noise under the Reduced Housing Alternative would be *equivalent* to those under the Proposed Project.

l. Population and Housing

Under the Reduced Housing Alternative, re-designations of land use to medium- or high-density residential would be more limited, and Danville would have decreased capacity to provide new housing, especially for low-income households and in areas near the Town's core. Instead, Danville would experience greater capacity for commercial, retail and job growth. Even under the Reduced Housing Alternative, Danville would still experience some lessened level of population growth and impacts. Additionally, reduced housing opportunities under this alternative would result in negative impacts to housing availability—most notably for economically underprivileged populations. Therefore, under the Reduced Housing Alternative, impacts to population and housing would be *greater* than those under the Proposed Project (Draft

2030 General Plan) and represent a *slight deterioration* compared to the Proposed Project.

m. Public Services and Recreation

Under the Reduced Housing Alternative, re-designations of land use to medium- or high-density residential would be more limited than under the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan), and Danville would likely experience diminished population growth. Though there would likely be increased capacity for job or commercial growth in lieu of this residential growth, such uses generate considerably less demand for public services and recreation facilities. Therefore, the impacts of the Reduced Housing Alternative on public services and recreation would be *less* than those of the Proposed Project and thus represent a *slight improvement* compared to the Proposed Project.

n. Transportation/Traffic

Under either the Reduced Housing Alternative or the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan), Danville would experience an increase in traffic volume. Changes in Danville traffic levels are primarily the result of regional growth and roadway congestion, and as discussed in the Traffic and Transportation section, neither the No Project Alternative nor the Proposed Project would result in significant project-level impacts. Since the Reduced Housing Alternative would allow a degree of development which falls between that of the Proposed Project and the No Project Alternative, it would also not cause significant project-level impacts. However, similar to the No Project Alternative, decreased residential development under the Reduced Housing Alternative could serve to reduce or prevent cumulative impacts. Therefore, the impacts of the Reduced Housing Alternative on transportation and traffic would be *less* than those of the Proposed Project and thus represent a *slight improvement* compared to the Proposed Project.

o. Utilities and Service Systems

Under the Reduced Housing Alternative, re-designations of land use to medium- or high-density residential would be more limited than under the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan), and the Town would likely experi-

ence lower population growth. Instead, there would likely be greater capacity for commercial developments and job increases. The demands placed upon utilities and service systems by these uses would depend highly upon exactly what type of commercial or retail establishments were developed. Industrial or manufacturing uses that have high utility demands would not be newly allowed. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that demands on these systems would not greatly differ between the Proposed Project and the Reduced Housing Alternative. Therefore, the impacts on utilities and service systems under the Reduced Housing Alternative would be *equivalent* to those under the Proposed Project.

3. Feasibility and Comparison to Project Objectives

The Reduced Housing Alternative would implement the same goals and policies as the Proposed Project (Draft 2030 General Plan). Additionally, the land use re-designations proposed under any of the alternatives do not present any feasibility concerns. Therefore the Reduced Housing Alternative and the Proposed Project are equally feasible.

The Reduced Housing Alternative would satisfy project objectives 1, 2, and 4, relating to Danville's character, quality of life, and physical setting. Both the Proposed Project and the Reduced Housing Alternative would continue existing policies affecting the attainment of these objectives, and proposed land use designations under the Draft 2030 General Plan would not detract from their attainment. The Reduced Housing Alternative, however, would at best only partially satisfy Objectives 3 and 5 relating, respectively, to allowing orderly and appropriate growth, and providing a variety of housing types. Since the Reduced Housing Alternative would forgo some land use re-designations to allow higher density housing on key opportunity sites, it would diminish Danville's capacity for residential growth and ability to provide affordable, multi-family housing. Under these conditions, Danville would meet these objectives less well than it would under the proposed project.

C. Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires the identification of the environmentally superior alternative in an EIR. Based on the above analysis, summarized in Table 5-2, the environmentally superior alternative is the Draft 2030 General Plan.

The only topics under which the Draft 2030 General Plan would have a greater impact than the project alternatives are Transportation and Traffic, and Public Services. The former represents an impact that could be best addressed through regional action and improved transit options; and the latter could be readily addressed through increases in local services commensurate with population growth. For all other topics, the Draft 2030 General Plan is either equivalent or superior to the project alternatives. The Draft 2030 General Plan would serve to prevent or reduce more environmental impacts than either of the two project alternatives, making it the environmentally superior alternative.

D. Recommended Alternative

The Draft 2030 General Plan satisfies all project objectives described in Chapter 3, Project Description, whereas neither the No Project Alternative nor the Reduced Housing Alternative do so. The No Project and Reduced Housing Alternatives both fail to completely satisfy Objectives 3 and 5. The No Project Alternative and the Reduced Housing Alternative would both restrict the orderly growth called for in Objective 3. The Reduced Housing Alternative would less effectively facilitate Objective 5, which calls the creation of a variety of housing types, per regional and State requirements; the No Project Alternative would fail to meet Objective 5.

Since Draft 2030 General Plan is the environmentally preferred alternative and is the only alternative which completely meets all five of the stated objectives, the Draft 2030 General Plan is selected as the Recommended Alternative.

E. Alternatives Considered But Rejected

Alternatives previously rejected include those which would have re-designated a larger number of properties as Housing Opportunity Sites (HOS). The initial list of potential HOS was developed as part of the Housing Element Update in 2008-09. The list included numerous sites considered to be underdeveloped given their location, zoning, site features, and improvement values. A community process was initiated to determine which of these sites should be further considered for density increases and which should be dropped from the list. The screening process occurred in two phases—first, through the Housing Element Update and second, through the General Plan Update. Re-designating all of the sites on the initial list was not pursued due to neighborhood concerns about traffic and community services, environmental resources, aesthetics, and community character.