

CHAPTER 6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that EIRs review a range of alternatives that might reduce or avoid the significant impacts of a proposed project. This chapter reviews the range of alternatives that were considered in developing this EIR. Some alternatives were rejected from analysis because they did not reduce environmental effects, were infeasible, or did not meet the project goals.

Alternatives are considered in an EIR to assist the public and decision-makers in considering the environmental consequences of a proposed project. The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to consider reasonable feasible options to reduce or avoid the significant impact of a proposed project. The range of alternatives to the proposed project is governed by the rule of reason. CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(a) states: "An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." Further, Section 15126.6(b) states: "...the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly."

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) states that "The range of potential alternatives to the project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the proposed project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination." Factors to be used to discard alternatives are "(i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

The "feasibility" of an alternative is evaluated by taking into account various factors, such as site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, consistency with government-approved plans and regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and by assessing whether the alternative, if it is at another location, is on land that can be reasonably acquired. The range of alternatives that must be studied in detail in an EIR includes a reasonable range of options that are both "feasible" and result in less adverse environmental impacts than the proposed project.

6.1 ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED

Seven alternatives were analyzed in lieu of the proposed project (asphalt plant project, LUO/LUE amendment, and asphalt plant and LUO/LUE amendment). These include: (1) No Asphalt Plant Action Alternative, (2) Reduced Processing Rate Project Alternative, (3) Fully Mitigated Asphalt Plant Alternative, (4) No LUO/LUE Amendment Action Alternative, (5) Modified LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative, (6) Fully Mitigated LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative, and (7) Fully Mitigated Asphalt Plant and LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative. Table

6-1 provides a qualitative comparison of the asphalt plant alternatives with respect to each issue area analyzed in Chapter 5.0, and 6-2 provides such a comparison for the LUO/LUE alternatives. 6-2 also provides a comparison of the asphalt plant and LUO/LUE combined alternatives.

6.1.1 Alternative 1 – No Asphalt Plant Action Alternative

Consideration of the No Project Alternative is required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(d)(3). The No Project Alternative must include consideration of what could be expected to occur in the reasonably foreseeable future, given the existing zoning and General Plan designations for the site. The current land use designations would remain. A metal fabrication facility has been used as a worst case used allowed under the CS land use designation. The No Asphalt Plant Action Alternative would not involve construction of the asphalt plant. Demand for asphaltic concrete would continue and impacts would be incurred either from an existing plant, or from a new plant that may be built elsewhere. The No Action alternative would not achieve the project objectives.

6.1.1.1 Land Use

Under this alternative, there would be no construction and operation of the asphaltic concrete plant and no changes to the land use designation. The worst-case land use for the 14.5-acre CS area would be a metal fabricating facility. When these uses are compared, they are similar in many respects; therefore, there would be minimal potential differences or conflicts with the surrounding uses. As such, impacts to land use would be similar or somewhat less under this alternative than the proposed project.

6.1.1.2 Aesthetics

Impacts to aesthetics would be similar under this alternative because the proposed asphaltic concrete plant would have similar visual impacts as the existing concrete batch plant and related facility as well as compared to a metal fabricating facility that is currently allowed. Similar impacts exist from exterior lighting, structure design, and outdoor storage as seen from the key public viewing areas. Therefore, impacts to aesthetics would be similar or slightly less under this alternative.

6.1.1.3 Air Quality

Impacts to air quality would be less under this alternative than the proposed project. No emissions would occur due to either construction or operation of the asphalt plant. When a metal fabrication facility is considered, emissions from this would be considered less than for an asphalt plant; therefore, impacts to air quality would be similar or less under this alternative.

Table 6-1. Qualitative Comparison of Asphalt Plant Project Alternatives

Alternative	Issue Area														
	LandUse	Aesthetics	Agricultural Resources	AirQuality	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology & Soils	Hazards/ Hazardous Materials	Noise	Population/ Housing	Public Services/ Utilities	Recreation	Transportation/ Circulation	Wastewater	Waster Resources
Proposed Project (Asphalt Plant Only)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1 – No Asphalt Plant Action	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
2 – Reduced Processing Rate	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2
3 – Fully Mitigated Asphalt Plant	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3

Note: 1 = Greatest Impact, 4 = Lowest Impact

Table 6-2. Qualitative Comparison of LUO/LUE Amendment Project Alternatives

Alternative	Issue Area														
	LandUse	Aesthetics	Agricultural Resources	AirQuality	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology & Soils	Hazards/ Hazardous Materials	Noise	Population/ Housing	Public Services/ Utilities	Recreation	Transportation/ Circulation	Wastewater	Waster Resources
Proposed Project (LUO/LUE Amendment Only)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
4 – No LUO/LUE Amendment Action	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5 – Modified LUO/LUE Amendment	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
6 – Fully Mitigated LUO/LUE Amendment	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Proposed Project (Asphalt Plant and LUO/LUE Amendment)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7 – Fully Mitigated Asphalt Plant and LUO/LUE Amendment	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Note: 1 = Greatest Impact, 5 = Lowest Impact

6.1.1.4 Biological Resources

Under this alternative, impacts to biological resources would be slightly reduced in comparison to the proposed project as no new development would encroach closer to sensitive vegetation or disrupt wildlife. However, when construction of a metal fabrication facility is considered impacts would be considered similar. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in reduced impacts to biological resources overall.

6.1.1.5 Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, there would be no impacts to cultural resources. While no resources were found from surface surveys, a slight potential may exist for encountering resources during grading. Therefore, no development would result in slighting reduced impacts. When a metal fabrication facility is considered, impacts would be similar.

6.1.1.6 Geology and Soils

Impacts to geology and soils would be less under this alternative than the proposed project. No construction and operation of the asphaltic concrete plant would occur; therefore, there would be no exposure of occupants to liquefaction, severe ground shaking, and land subsidence during an earthquake. When a metal fabrication facility is considered, impacts would be slightly greater due to exposure of more employees than an asphalt plant.

6.1.1.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than the proposed project. Because there would no be construction of the proposed asphalt plant, installation of asphaltic oil aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) that could potentially impact the project site and potentially the Santa Maria River if ruptured during an upset condition, would not take place. Furthermore, there would no use of diesel fuel or other petroleum hydrocarbon-containing liquids to coat the beds of trucks hauling asphalt from the proposed facility that could result in the contamination of soil, storm water, and groundwater. In addition, there would no release of hazardous materials during a storm event from either the asphalt plant. When a metal fabrication facility is considered, similar impacts from hazardous materials or conditions may exist when compared to the asphalt plant.

6.1.1.8 Noise

Both short-term and long-term noise impacts would be less under this alterantive than the proposed project. Construction activities and asphalt plant operations that would result in noise impacts to nearby residences would not occur. However, if a metal fabrication facility is considered, noise impacts would be similar or slightly greater when compared to the asphalt plant.

6.1.1.9 Population and Housing

Under this alternative, population and housing impacts would be reduced in comparison with the proposed project. Specifically, without the construction of the proposed asphalt plant, there would be the reduction in potential job opportunities within the area. Because job opportunities have a direct effect on the local population, there would also be less demand on housing. When a metal fabrication facility is considered, population and housing impacts would be slightly greater due to the likelihood of more employees.

6.1.1.10 Public Services and Utilities

Impacts to fire protection and other public services would be less under this alternative than the proposed project because there would be no construction of the asphaltic concrete plant. However, when a metal fabrication facility is considered, the types and frequencies of incidents and new employee-generated impacts would be similar to or slightly greater than an asphalt plant.

6.1.1.11 Recreation

Under this alternative (no development), the demand for recreational facilities would be reduced because there would not be any additional job opportunities within the project site which would otherwise result in an increased local population. However, in regards to the Santa Maria River Trail, a portion of the required trail easement would not be acquired. Equestrians and pedestrians would continue to utilize undeveloped pathways within the floodplains of the Santa Maria River for recreational purposes. Under the No Project alternative, certain recreational uses are allowed under the existing land use category that are not allowed under the Industrial category. Under this premise, impacts to recreation would be less under the No Project alternative. However, if a metal fabrication facility is considered, impacts to recreation would be considered similar to the asphalt plant.

6.1.1.12 Transportation and Circulation

Impacts to transportation and circulation under this alternative would be less than the proposed project. There would be no impacts to local roadways or intersections associated with haul trips generated from operations of the plant, since the trips will not occur. Furthermore, there would be no impacts to the physical conditions of roadways associated with truck trips hauling manufacturing-related materials. However, when a metal fabrication facility is considered, transportation impacts would be considered similar to an asphalt plant.

6.1.1.13 Wastewater

Under this alternative alternative, wastewater impacts would be less as no additional effluent would be generated. However, if a metal fabrication facility is considered, impacts would be similar or somewhat greater, depending on the increase of employees when compared to an asphalt plant.

6.1.1.14 Water Resources

Impacts to water resources would be less under this alternative than the proposed project. No potential stormwater run-off to the Santa Maria River would occur, nor would groundwater pumping from the onsite well, increases in pervious surfaces, overflow of the proposed detention basin, percolation of rainfall through lime-treated aggregate, generation of contaminated stormwater runoff, and construction of the plant in the 100-year floodplain. However, if the metal fabrication facility is considered, impacts would be similar when compared to the asphalt plant.

6.1.2 Alternative 2 - Reduced Processing Rate Project Alternative

For comparative analysis, it is assumed that a Reduced Processing Rate Project Alternative would allow for the change to Industrial for the asphalt plant site (14.5 acres) and reduce the annual processing rate of the proposed project by 50 percent. The Applicant requests a CUP to produce a maximum of 400,000 tons of asphaltic concrete per year. Essentially, under this alternative, the processing rate would be reduced to 200,000 tons of asphaltic concrete per year. Table 6-3 summarizes the modified asphalt production capacity for the site. This alternative would require the same work area, tanks, stockpiles, etc., except the processing rate would be reduced by 50 percent. This alternative was chosen because this alternative may still be economically feasible and because some of the impacts, including air quality, may be reduced from significant to less than significant.

Table 6-3. Expected Asphalt Production Capacity

Scenario	Units	Production (Outbound)
Maximum Annual	tons/yr	200,000
Peak Daily	tons/day	3,000
Average Daily	tons/day	660
Peak Hourly	tons/hr	175
Average Hourly	tons/hr	33

Project related traffic at a reduced processing rate would be reduced 50 percent as well, as shown in Table 6-3.

Table 6-4. Traffic - Reduced Processing Rate Alternative

Scenario	Units	Employees	Raw Materials	Asphaltic Oil	Asphalt Deliveries
Peak Daily	ADT (one-way trips)	24	108	14	120
Average Daily	ADT (one-way trips)	24	22	2	26

6.1.2.1 Land Use

Under this alternative, the same size plant would be constructed as the proposed project; however, it would be operated at 50% of the proposed annual processing rate. Therefore, there would be the same short-term impacts; however, there would be less long-term traffic, and air quality than the proposed project. To the extent that the reduction of such impacts would provide for increased consistency of the project with relevant plans and policies and would reduce adverse effects on community character, this alternative would result in less impacts relating to land use than the proposed project.

6.1.2.2 Aesthetics

Under this alternative, the same size plant would be constructed as the proposed project; however, it would be operated at 50% of the proposed annual processing rate. Therefore, there would be the same short-term and long-term impacts to aesthetics under this alternative as the proposed project.

6.1.2.3 Air Quality

Under the Reduced Impact Alternative, impacts to air quality would be less than the proposed project. Although short-term impacts associated with construction would remain unchanged, there would be less long-term impacts because the plant would be operated at 50% of the proposed annual processing rate. A 50% reduction in the annual processing rate would equate to a 50% reduction in operating emissions and mobile source emissions. There may also be less human health risks associated with this alternative. However, there may be an increase in vehicle emissions from vehicles carrying finished product for longer distance from other asphalt plants.

6.1.2.4 Biological Resources

Under the Reduced Impact Alternative, impacts to biological resources would be similar in comparison with the proposed project. Because the development of the asphalt plant would occur under this alternative, the same potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the asphalt plant would occur. Therefore, the Reduced Impact Alternative would result in similar impacts to biological resources when compared to the proposed "full production" asphalt plant.

6.1.2.5 Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, the physical impacts to potential cultural resources would be the same as the full project.

6.1.2.6 Geology and Soils

Impacts to geology and soils would be similar under this alternative in comparison to the proposed project. Construction related impacts associated with both the asphaltic concrete plant would be the same. The potential exposure of occupants of asphalt plant to liquefaction, severe ground shaking, and land subsidence during an earthquake would

be slightly less given employees on-site would average 50 percent less, reducing potential exposure.

6.1.2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impacts to hazards and hazardous materials under this alternative would be the same as the proposed project. Construction of the proposed asphalt plant and installation of asphaltic oil aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), which could potentially impact the project site and potentially the Santa Maria River if ruptured during an upset condition, would occur. In addition, the potential release of hazardous materials during a storm event from the asphalt plant would remain the same.

6.1.2.8 Noise

Short-term noise impacts associated with construction of the asphaltic concrete plant would be the same as the proposed project. Long-term noise impacts may be less under the reduced processing rate alternative if nighttime operations are less.

6.1.2.9 Population and Housing

Under the Reduced Impact Alternative, population and housing impacts would not be slightly reduced in comparison with the proposed project. Because the development of the asphalt plant would occur under this alternative, the same amount of temporary employees would be needed in comparison to the proposed project. The number of permanent employees would likely be reduced by half, thereby reducing housing demands.

6.1.2.10 Public Services and Utilities

Under this alternative, the same size plant would be constructed as the proposed project; however, it would be operated at 50% of the proposed annual processing rate. Impacts to solid waste, police protection, and fire protection services may be less under this alternative than the proposed project. There would be less solid waste generated that would have to be disposed at the Cold Canyon Landfill, reduced use of hazardous materials, and possibly reduced nighttime operations, which may lower the need for police protection services.

6.1.2.11 Recreation

Under this alternative, the processing rate of the plant would be reduced by 50%. This reduction in production would result in similar impacts to recreation as those under the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no change in impacts to recreation.

6.1.2.12 Transportation and Circulation

Impacts to transportation and circulation under this alternative would be less than the proposed project. As shown in Table 6-3, the number of truck trips associated with operations would be approximately 50% of those of the proposed project, which would reduce the impacts to local roadways or intersections associated.

6.1.2.13 Wastewater

Impacts to wastewater would be similar under this alternative as the proposed project. Although there might be less generation of wastewater due to reduced operations, this is considered negligible.

6.1.2.14 Water Resources

Impacts to water resources would be less under this alternative than the proposed project. Because the processing rate would be less, the amount of groundwater pumping from the onsite well would be less, which could result in reduced impacts.

6.1.3 Alternative 3 - Fully Mitigated Asphalt Plant Alternative

The Fully Mitigated Asphalt Plant Alternative is an alternative whereby the mitigation measures identified in Chapter 5.0 to reduce significant or potentially significant impacts associated with construction and operation of the asphalt plant to less than significant levels are factored into the project. With the mitigation measures included in the asphalt plant project as proposed, the asphalt plant project becomes an entity that is defined differently than originally proposed.

6.1.3.1 Land Use

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize land use impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed asphalt plant would be incorporated into the proposed asphalt plant project. Thus, impacts to land use would be less than the proposed asphalt plant project.

6.1.3.2 Aesthetics

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize visual impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed asphalt plant would be incorporated into the proposed asphalt plant project. Thus, impacts to aesthetics would be less than the proposed asphalt plant project.

6.1.3.3 Air Quality

Impacts to air quality would be less under this alternative than the proposed asphalt plant project because potential impacts to air quality associated with construction and operation of the asphalt plant would be mitigated.

6.1.3.4 Biological Resources

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts to biological resources associated with construction and operation of the proposed asphalt plant would be incorporated into the asphalt plant proposed project. Thus, impacts to land use would be less than the asphalt plant proposed project.

6.1.3.5 Cultural Resources

While no resources were found from surface surveys, a slight potential may exist for encountering resources during grading. A mitigation measure has been proposed to minimize impacts to cultural resources in the event such resources are identified during construction. Therefore, the fully mitigated asphalt plant alternative would have less

impacts to cultural resources than the proposed asphalt plant project in the event cultural resources were identified during construction.

6.1.3.6 Geology and Soils

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed asphalt plant would be incorporated into the proposed asphalt plant project. Thus, impacts to geology and soils would be less than the proposed asphalt plant project.

6.1.3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts associated with construction and operation of the asphalt plant would be incorporated into the proposed asphalt plant project. Thus, impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than the proposed asphalt plant project.

6.1.3.8 Noise

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts associated with construction and operation of the asphalt plant would be incorporated into the proposed asphalt plant project. Thus, impacts to noise would be less than the proposed asphalt plant project.

6.1.3.9 Population and Housing

Because there are no mitigation measures necessary to minimize impacts to population and housing population, the Fully Mitigated Project Alternative would result in the same impacts as the proposed project.

6.1.3.10 Public Services and Utilities

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts associated with construction and operation of the asphalt plant would be incorporated into the proposed asphalt project. Thus, impacts to public services would be less than the asphalt plant proposed project.

6.1.3.11 Recreation

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts associated with construction and operation of the asphalt plant would be incorporated into the proposed asphalt plant project. Thus, impacts to recreation would be less than the proposed asphalt plant project.

6.1.3.12 Transportation and Circulation

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize transportation and circulation impacts associated with construction and operation of the asphalt plant would be incorporated into the proposed asphalt project. Thus, impacts to would be less than the proposed asphalt plant project.

6.1.3.13 Wastewater

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize wastewater impacts associated with construction and operation of the asphalt plant would be incorporated into the proposed asphalt plant project. Thus, impacts to wastewater would be less than the proposed asphalt plant project.

6.1.3.14 Water Resources

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize water resources impacts associated with construction and operation of the asphalt plant would be incorporated into the proposed asphalt plant project. Thus, impacts to water resources would be less than the asphalt plant proposed project.

6.1.4 Alternative 4 – No LUO/LUE Amendment Action Alternative

Under this alternative, the current land use designations would remain (44.5 acres of CS and 9.3 acres of RS). A metal fabrication facility has been used as a worst case used allowed under the CS land use designation and a residential care facility for RS. The No LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative would not involve changing the land use designation of the amendment area, which would prevent future industrial development adjacent to the asphalt plant. This alternative would not achieve the following project objectives:

1. Industrial-related land uses to take place within the approximately 44.7-acre area currently zoned as Commercial Service;
2. Allow for industrial-related land uses to take place within the approximately 9.3-acre area currently zoned as Residential Suburban; and,
3. Encourage better consistency of land use within the area below the bluff top edge, based on existing uses within the area.

6.1.4.1 Land Use

Under this alternative, there would be no changes to the land use designations. The worst-case land use for the 44.5-acre CS area would be a metal fabricating facility and for the 9.3-acres residential suburban area it would be a residential day care facility. When these uses are compared, impacts to land use would be less under this alternative than the proposed project because future industrial development may be less consistent with existing plans and policies. However, if the asphalt plant were to be constructed, impacts to future residential development occur; thus, causing land use consistency impacts.

6.1.4.2 Aesthetics

Impacts to aesthetics would be less under this alternative because future industrial development may have greater visual impacts than a metal fabricating facility and a residential care facility that is currently allowed. Greater impacts from exterior lighting, structure design, and outdoor storage as seen from the key public viewing areas may occur from either a chemical products of metal machinery manufacturing facility as

opposed to a metal fabrication facility or residential care facility. Therefore, impacts to aesthetics would be less under this alternative.

6.1.4.3 Air Quality

Impacts to air quality would be less under this alternative than the proposed project. Greater emissions may occur from either a chemical products or metal machinery manufacturing facility as opposed to a metal fabrication facility or residential care facility. Therefore, impacts to air quality would be less under this alternative.

6.1.4.4 Biological Resources

When construction of a metal fabrication facility or residential care facility is considered impacts would be considered similar as either a chemical products or metal machinery manufacturing facility. Therefore, this alternative would result in similar impacts to biological resources overall.

6.1.4.5 Cultural Resources

No resources were found from surface surveys; however, a slight potential may exist for encountering resources during grading. When a metal fabrication facility is considered, impacts would be similar to either a chemical products or metal machinery manufacturing facility. Therefore, impacts would be similar under this alternative.

6.1.4.6 Geology and Soils

There may be a greater number of employees with a residential care facility than either a chemical products or metal machinery manufacturing facility; therefore, there would be greater exposure of occupants to liquefaction, severe ground shaking, and land subsidence during an earthquake. Under this alternative, impacts would be slightly greater due to exposure of more employees.

6.1.4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

A chemical products or metal machinery manufacturing facility would have greater impacts due to the likely increase in use and storage of hazardous materials as compared to a metal fabrication facility or a residential care facility. Therefore, impacts would be less under this alternative.

6.1.4.8 Noise

Short-term noise impacts would be similar for a metal fabrication facility or a residential care facility in comparison to either a chemical products or metal machinery manufacturing facility. However, long-term noise impacts may more extensive for the latter. Therefore, noise impacts would be less under this alternative.

6.1.4.9 Population and Housing

Under this alternative, population and housing impacts would be greater in comparison with the proposed LUO/LUE amendment. A metal fabrication facility would likely have a similar number of employees as either a chemical products or metal machinery

manufacturing facility; however, a residential care facility may have more. Therefore, population and housing impacts would be slightly greater under this alternative due to the likelihood of more employees.

6.1.4.10 Public Services and Utilities

Impacts to fire protection and other public services would be less under this alternative than the proposed LUO/LUE amendment. The types and frequencies of incidents and new employee-generated impacts would be greater with either a chemical products or metal machinery manufacturing facility than a metal fabrication facility or a residential care facility. Therefore, impacts would be less under this alternative.

6.1.4.11 Recreation

In comparison of either a chemical products or metal machinery manufacturing facility to a metal fabrication facility or residential care facility, impacts to recreation would be considered similar. Therefore, impacts under this alternative would be less than the proposed LUO/LUE amendment.

6.1.4.12 Transportation and Circulation

Impacts to transportation and circulation under this alternative would be less than the proposed LUO/LUE amendment. A metal fabrication facility would have similar transportation/circulation impacts as either a chemical products or metal machinery manufacturing facility; however, a residential care facility would have less. Therefore, impacts would be less under this alternative.

6.1.4.13 Wastewater

A metal fabrication facility would produce a similar amount of industrial wastewater as either a chemical products or metal machinery manufacturing facility, a residential care facility would produce less. However, a residential care facility may produce more municipal wastewater. Therefore, impacts under this alternative would be similar to the proposed LUO/LUE amendment.

6.1.4.14 Water Resources

Impacts to water resources would be similar under this alternative than the proposed LUO/LUE amendment. Similar to either a chemical products or metal machinery manufacturing facility, a metal fabrication facility would cause stormwater run-off to the Santa Maria River would occur, would cause groundwater pumping, increases in pervious surfaces, generation of contaminated stormwater runoff, and construction of facilities in the 100-year floodplain. The residential care facility may result in greater groundwater pumping, but less stormwater run-off or water contamination. Therefore, impacts under this alternative would be similar as the proposed LUO/LUE amendment.

6.1.5 Alternative 5 – Modified Land Use Ordinance Amendment Alternative

The Project has two components, including: 1) LUO/LUE Amendment; and 2) concurrent Conditional Use Permit (CUP) request. The amendment involves amending the South County Area Plan of the Land Use Element to change the land use category of approximately 9.3 acres from RS to IND and 44.7 acres from Commercial Service CS to IND. The CUP is for development of a 14.5-acre portion of the area to allow construction and operation of a portable stand-alone asphaltic concrete plant and ancillary facilities to allow production of a maximum of 400,000 tons of asphaltic concrete per year.

Under this alternative, the CUP request would remain as described in Chapter 3.0; however, the LUO/LUE Amendment would be modified. Specifically, the LUO/LUE Amendment would not include the following two parcels: (1) 090-302-034 and (2) 090-302-035 [Excluded Area]. Parcel 090-302-034 is 4.59 acres and is currently zoned Commercial Service and the other parcel is 2.5 acres and is currently zoned Residential Suburban. See Figure 6-1.

6.1.5.1 Land Use

Under this alternative, the Excluded Area would reduce the potential for industrial land uses, such as a metal machinery manufacturing or a chemical products manufacturing facility to be constructed. This would result in a 2.5-acre parcel designated as RS that would be surrounded by non-compatible industrial uses, which would result in substantially more land use conflicts than the proposed project. Therefore, land use impacts under this alternative would be greater than the proposed project.

6.1.5.2 Aesthetics

Under this alternative, the total square-footage of machinery manufacturing uses would be less; however, allowed CS uses can be equally as visible; therefore, impacts to aesthetics would be similar under this alternative. Regarding the RS parcel and given the constraints of building on the bluff for residences or commercial, and existing CS development in the foreground, impacts are considered similar.

6.1.5.3 Air Quality

This alternative would result in a net reduction of possible future industrial development by 7.09 acres. This reduction could lower the amount of manufacturing-related air quality emissions associated within industrial uses (e.g., chemical products or metal machinery manufacturing plant), which could reduce the potential adverse effect to local and regional air quality and possible human health risks. However, certain uses allowed within the CS category could result in similar air quality impacts. As such, impacts to air quality would be similar to slightly less under this alternative than the proposed project.

6.1.5.4 Biological Resources

Under the Modified LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative, impacts to biological resources would be slightly reduced in comparison to the proposed project. Specifically, because the parcel of Residential Suburban would not be changed to Industrial, there would potentially be less non-permeable surfaces within the parcel and a potential for more vegetation cover availability for wildlife species. In regards to the other parcel which

would remain Commercial Service, it is expected that this parcel would have a similar impact in comparison to the proposed Industrial land use, thus resulting in no additional impacts to biological resources.

6.1.5.5 Cultural Resources

Because the Excluded Area was not included in the archaeological study, it is unknown whether there would be any change in impacts to cultural resources. Even if these parcels were not included in the LUO/LUE, an archaeological survey would need to be completed prior to construction on these parcels.

6.1.5.6 Geology and Soils

Impacts associated with construction and operation of the asphaltic concrete plant would be the same as the proposed project. Under this alternative, the potential exposure of occupants of the asphalt plant to liquefaction, severe ground shaking, and land subsidence during an earthquake would be the same as the proposed project. Potential impacts associated with future industrial development within the LUO/LUE amendment area would be similar under this alternative. While there would be fewer potential employees exposed to potential geologic risk under this alternative, there would be an increase of sensitive receptors from retaining the RS category, Therefore potential impacts related to geology and soils would be considered similar.

6.1.5.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impacts to hazards and hazardous materials under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project. Construction of the proposed asphalt plant and installation of asphaltic oil aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), which could potentially impact the project site and potentially the Santa Maria River if ruptured during an upset condition, would still occur. Furthermore, there would be use of diesel fuel or other petroleum hydrocarbon-containing liquids to coat the beds of trucks hauling asphalt from the proposed facility that could result in the contamination of soil, storm water, and groundwater. Also, there could be a release of hazardous materials during a storm event from either the asphalt plant or from future industrial development within the LUO/LUE amendment area. Since there would be slightly less area available for uses that may involve hazardous materials, there may be a slightly less impacts to hazards and hazardous materials with this alternative.

6.1.5.8 Noise

Both short-term and long-term noise impacts associated with the asphalt plant would be similar to or somewhat greater under this alternative as the proposed project. Construction activities and asphalt plant operations would result in similar noise impacts to nearby residences. There may be a slightly less potential noise impacts to noise-sensitive receptors when the heavier industrial uses are compared to the CS uses, which would be allowed over a smaller area. However, a portion of the area proposed for industrial would remain as residential use, which would not be able to take advantage of the sound deflecting topography of the bluff face that is afforded the RS properties on top of the mesa.



Basemap Source: County of San Luis Obispo

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

6.1.5.9 Population and Housing

Under the Modified LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative, population and housing impacts would result in slightly reduced impacts in comparison to the proposed project. Specifically, because the RS parcel would not be changed to IND, there would continue to be opportunities to construct housing with the parcel. In regards to the other parcel which would remain CS, it is expected that this parcel would have an equal density in comparison to an IND land use, thus resulting in no additional impacts to population and housing.

6.1.5.10 Public Services and Utilities

With this alternative, there would be less industrial development and greater residential development. As such, impacts to fire protection may be less, but impacts to schools and police protection would be greater.

6.1.5.11 Recreation

Under the modified LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative, the proposed asphalt plant would not be modified. As such, this alternative would not result in a change in impacts to recreation associated with the asphalt plant. Additionally, this alternative would not have an impact on the proposed Santa Maria River Trail. The exclusion of the two parcels under this alternative would allow these parcels to be available for potential future recreational land uses which would otherwise be excluded under the IND land use category. As a result, this alternative would have reduced impacts to recreation than the proposed project.

6.1.5.12 Transportation and Circulation

Impacts to transportation and circulation under this alternative could be slightly less than the proposed project. Impacts to roadways and intersections associated with the asphalt plant would be the same as the proposed project; however, impacts associated with the LUO/LUE amendment may be less. This would be due primarily to the smaller amount of potential truck trips expected from the RS designation proposed to be retained.

6.1.5.13 Wastewater

Impacts to wastewater may be less under this alternative than the proposed project due to a reduction in the total area that would be designated IND; therefore, the corresponding decrease in water use and resulting decrease in municipal wastewater generation would be less than the proposed project.

6.1.5.14 Water Resources

Impacts to water resources associated within construction and operation of the asphalt plant would be the same as the proposed project. However, impacts to water resources associated with the LUO/LUE amendment may be less. Because there would be less impermeable development associated with this alternative when compared to residences

in the RS category, stormwater run-off to the Santa Maria River from development may be reduced.

6.1.6 Alternative 6 - Fully Mitigated LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative

The Fully Mitigated LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative is an alternative whereby the mitigation measures identified in Chapter 5.0 to reduce significant or potentially significant impacts associated with the LUO/LUE to less than significant levels are factored into the project. With the mitigation measures included in the LUO/LUE Amendment as proposed, the LUO/LUE Amendment becomes an entity that is defined differently than originally proposed.

6.1.6.1 Land Use

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize land use impacts associated with the LUO/LUE amendment would be incorporated into the proposed amendment. Thus, impacts to land use would be less than the proposed amendment.

6.1.6.2 Aesthetics

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize visual impacts associated with the LUO/LUE amendment would be incorporated into the proposed amendment. Thus, impacts to aesthetics would be less than the proposed amendment.

6.1.6.3 Air Quality

Impacts to air quality would be less under this alternative than the proposed LUO/LUE amendment because potential impacts to air quality associated with the proposed amendment would be mitigated.

6.1.6.4 Biological Resources

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts to biological resources associated with the LUO/LUE amendment would be incorporated into the amendment. Thus, impacts to biological resources would be less than the proposed amendment.

6.1.6.5 Cultural Resources

A mitigation measure has been proposed to minimize impacts to historic resources. Therefore, the Fully Mitigated LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative would have less impacts to cultural resources than the proposed amendment.

6.1.6.6 Geology and Soils

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts to geology and soils associated with the LUO/LUE amendment would be incorporated into the amendment. Thus, impacts to geology and soils would be less than the proposed amendment.

6.1.6.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts to hazards and hazardous materials associated with the LUO/LUE amendment would be

incorporated into the amendment. Therefore, impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than the proposed amendment.

6.1.6.8 Noise

Impacts to noise would be less under this alternative than the proposed LUO/LUE amendment because potential impacts to noise associated with the proposed amendment would be mitigated.

6.1.6.9 Population and Housing

Because there are no mitigation measures necessary to minimize impacts to population and housing population, the Fully Mitigated LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative would result in the same impacts as the proposed amendment.

6.1.6.10 Public Services and Utilities

Impacts to public services and utilities would be less under this alternative than the proposed LUO/LUE amendment because potential impacts to public services and utilities associated with the proposed amendment would be mitigated.

6.1.6.11 Recreation

Impacts to recreation would be less under this alternative than the proposed LUO/LUE amendment because potential impacts to recreation associated with the proposed amendment would be mitigated.

6.1.6.12 Transportation and Circulation

Impacts to transportation and circulation would be less under this alternative than the proposed LUO/LUE amendment because potential impacts to transportation and circulation associated with the proposed amendment would be mitigated.

6.1.6.13 Wastewater

Impacts to wastewater would be less under this alternative than the proposed LUO/LUE amendment because potential impacts to wastewater associated with the proposed amendment would be mitigated.

6.1.6.14 Water Resources

Impacts to water resources would be less under this alternative than the proposed LUO/LUE amendment because potential impacts to water resources associated with the proposed amendment would be mitigated.

6.1.7 Alternative 7 - Fully Mitigated Asphalt Plant and LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative

The Fully Mitigated Asphalt Plant and Fully Mitigated LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative is an alternative whereby the mitigation measures identified in Chapter 5.0 to reduce significant or potentially significant impacts associated with construction and operation of the asphalt plant and the LUO/LUE Amendment to less than significant levels are factored into the project. With

the mitigation measures included in the asphalt plant project as proposed and the LUO/LUE Amendment, the asphalt plant project and the LUO/LUE Amendment becomes an entity that is defined differently than originally proposed.

6.1.7.1 Land Use

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize land use impacts would be incorporated into the proposed project. Thus, impacts to land use would be less than the proposed project.

6.1.7.2 Aesthetics

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize visual impacts would be incorporated into the proposed project. Thus, impacts to aesthetics would be less than the proposed project.

6.1.7.3 Air Quality

Impacts to air quality would be less under this alternative than the proposed project because potential impacts to air quality associated with construction and operation of the asphalt plant or future industrial development within the LUO/LUE amendment area would be mitigated.

6.1.7.4 Biological Resources

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts to biological resources would be incorporated into the proposed project. Thus, impacts to land use would be less than the proposed project.

6.1.7.5 Cultural Resources

Impacts to cultural resources would be less under this alternative than the proposed project because potential impacts to the historic structure would be mitigated and any unforeseen impacts associated with future industrial development within the LUO/LUE amendment area would be mitigated.

6.1.7.6 Geology and Soils

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts would be incorporated into the proposed project. Thus, impacts to geology and soils would be less than the proposed project.

6.1.7.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts would be incorporated into the proposed project. Thus, impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than the proposed project.

6.1.7.8 Noise

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts would be incorporated into the proposed project. Thus, impacts to noise would be less than the proposed project.

6.1.7.9 Population and Housing

Because there are no mitigation measures necessary to minimize impacts to population and housing population, the Fully Mitigated Project Alternative would result in the same impacts as the proposed project.

6.1.7.10 Public Services and Utilities

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts would be incorporated into the proposed project. Thus, impacts to public services would be less than the proposed project.

6.1.7.11 Recreation

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize impacts would be incorporated into the proposed project. Thus, impacts to recreation would be less than the proposed project.

6.1.7.12 Transportation and Circulation

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize transportation and circulation impacts would be incorporated into the proposed project. Thus, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

6.1.7.13 Wastewater

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize wastewater impacts would be incorporated into the proposed project. Thus, impacts to wastewater would be less than the proposed project.

6.1.7.14 Water Resources

Under this alternative, all mitigation measures proposed to minimize water resources impacts would be incorporated into the proposed project. Thus, impacts to water resources would be less than the proposed project.

6.1.8 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6(a) and (e)(2)) require that an EIR's analysis of alternatives identify the "environmentally superior alternative" among all of those considered. In addition, if the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, then the EIR also must identify the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

Under CEQA, the goal of identifying the Environmentally Superior Alternative is to assist decision-makers in considering project approval. CEQA does not, however, require an agency to select the environmentally superior alternative (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15042-15043).

In the comparison presented in Table 6-1, it is apparent that Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would generally have fewer impacts than the proposed asphalt plant project and neither of them would have greater impacts on any resource than the proposed project. The same County air quality

significance threshold that would be exceeded by the proposed project would be exceeded (albeit somewhat less) with the reduced project alternative.

The modified LUO/LUE amendment alternative would have slightly less impacts to biological resources because the parcel of RS would not be changed to IND; therefore, would potentially be less non-permeable surfaces within the parcel and a potential for more vegetation cover availability for wildlife species. Generally, alternatives 4, 5, and 6 would have less impacts than the LUO/LUE amendment.

As shown in Table 6-1, the fully mitigated asphalt plant alternative is identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative for construction of the asphalt plant because it would meet all of the project objectives identified in the Project Description for the asphalt plant while minimizing environmental impacts. The no asphalt plant action alternative would not meet any of the asphalt plant project objectives, such as production and delivery of asphaltic concrete, and alternative 2 would meet these objectives, except that the high quality asphaltic concrete would not be supplied to the community at as competitive of a price due to the reduced processing rate. Therefore, the fully mitigated asphalt plant alternative that includes all mitigation measures factored into the asphalt plant project is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

As shown in Table 6-2, the fully mitigated LUO/LUE amendment alternative is the identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative for amendment to the LUO/LUE because it would meet all of the objectives of the LUO/LUE amendment while minimizing environmental impacts. In general, the Fully Mitigated LUO/LUE amendment alternative would have less impacts than the modified LUO/LUE amendment alternative. Therefore, this alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the LUO/LUE amendment.

For comparative purposes, Alternative 7, which includes the fully mitigated asphalt plant and the fully mitigated LUO/LUE amendment, is environmentally superior over the proposed asphalt plant and LUO/LUE amendment.