

---

---

## VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

---

---

The CEQA Guidelines require that EIRs include the identification and evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives that are designed to reduce the significant environmental impacts of the project while still meeting the general project objectives. The CEQA Guidelines also set forth the intent and extent of alternatives analysis to be provided in an EIR. Those considerations are discussed below.

### **Alternatives to the Proposed Project**

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines 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 comparable 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 decisionmaking and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.”

### **Purpose**

Section 15126.6(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states: “Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment, 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 project objectives, or would be more costly.”

### **Selection of a Reasonable Range of Alternatives**

Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states: “The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the 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. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.”

## Overview of Selected Alternatives

The alternatives to be analyzed in comparison to the proposed project include:

Alternative A: No Project Alternative

Alternative B: 61-Unit Condominium and Townhouse Project Alternative

Alternative C: 50-Unit Planned Unit Development (PUD) Alternative

Alternative D: 102-Unit Density Bonus Alternative

**Alternatives Rejected as Being Infeasible.** As described above, Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to 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. Alternatives involving commercial, recreational and/or industrial land uses were dismissed as being infeasible because the project site is not zoned for such uses, they would not meet any of the applicant's project objectives and other than recreational uses, they may not be compatible with existing land uses in the area. An alternative involving single-family homes on the site was also rejected as being infeasible because it would not meet the project objectives and such an alternative would not be financially viable due to the slope stability improvements required for the entire site. Finally, an alternative site for the proposed project was rejected as being infeasible because it would not meet the applicant's objective to build multi-family dwelling units in the Pacific Palisades, as the applicant does not own other property in the community that is zoned for multi-family housing.

## Assumptions and Methodology

The anticipated means for implementation of the alternatives can influence the assessment and/or probability of impacts for those alternatives. For example, a project may have the potential to generate impacts, but considerations in project design may also afford the opportunity to avoid or reduce such impacts. The alternatives analysis is presented as a comparative analysis to the proposed project, and assumes that all applicable mitigation measures proposed for the project would apply to each alternative. Impacts associated with the alternatives are compared to project-related impacts and are classified as greater, less, or essentially similar to (or comparable to) the level of impacts associated with the proposed project.

The following alternatives analysis compares the potential environmental impacts of four alternatives with those of the proposed project for each of the environmental topics analyzed in detail in Section IV (Environmental Impact Analysis) of the EIR.