7.0 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this section describes a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project. The analysis focuses on alternatives capable of avoiding or substantially lessening the project's significant environmental effects, even if the alternative would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the proposed project objectives, or would be more costly. The range of required alternatives is governed by the "rule of reason" that requires the analysis to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives are limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the project's significant effects. Of those alternatives, only the ones that the lead agency has determined could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives are examined in detail.

TOWN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Town is comprised of 12 districts and four mountain portals, as described in the Neighborhood and District Character Element of the 2007 General Plan. Master planning of these specific districts provides a basis for future land use decisions incorporating the goals, policies, and actions in the Land Use and Community Design Elements as well as the Neighborhood and District Character Element. The characteristics of each district provide a sense of place regarding structure, function, and a district center. The project site is located in the North Village District and the identified characteristics for this district are as follows:

- Viewsheds to Sherwin Range and the Knolls are preserved;
- Landscape that recalls the Eastern Sierra and establishes scale and street edge;
- Create a sense of exploration using pedestrian-oriented sidewalks, plazas, and courtyards with pedestrian comforts;
- Easy pedestrian access across main streets;
- Gateway intersection at Minaret Road and Main Street/Lake Mary Road;
- Visitor-oriented entertainment retail district;
- Active day and evening through all four seasons, designed to achieve a two to three hour visit;
- Resort and resident activities, amenities, and services;
- Animation with retail and significant businesses oriented to the street;
- Retail and services in "storefront" setting located at the sidewalk;

- A variety of resort lodging supported by meeting facilities, outdoor activities, and restaurants, arts, culture, and entertainment;
- Create year-round non-vehicular links to mountain portals;
- Lake Mary Road connected to the North Village District by trails;
- Shared and pooled parking, convenient structured parking, and small-scale street adjacent surface parking; and
- Encourage living and working in close proximity to transit-oriented development.

NORTH VILLAGE SPECIFIC PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The North Village Specific Plan (NVSP) aims to create a set of land use designations and development standards which facilitate the development (or renovation) of the NVSP area as a concentrated, pedestrian-oriented activity center with limited vehicular access. The NVSP is intended to achieve year-round uses and visitor activity, strengthen the existing winter visitor market, and improve Mammoth's attractiveness to spring, summer, and fall resort visitors. The key objective of the NVSP, and consequently the Land Use Element, is to enhance the Town's image as a destination resort community, through the creation of a high profile, pedestrian-oriented, resort activity center where lodging, restaurants, shopping, housing, and recreational opportunities are located within proximity to one another and easily accessible by transit.

There are six land use districts established within the NVSP. As previously noted, the project site is located in the NVSP, Resort General (RG) district. RG district has been assigned to parcels adjacent to and easily accessible to the plaza, but still within the Pedestrian Core Overlay area. The Pedestrian Core area is intended to be a mixed-use village with commercial uses on the ground level and accommodation units on upper floors. The scale of the individual ground level shops vary. RG uses are intended to provide visitor-oriented resort services, but retail uses are limited to multi-tenant complexes or within full-service hotels. Restaurants are generally the only freestanding uses permitted in the NVSP RG district.

The RG objectives identified in NVSP are as follows:

- To provide resort accommodations and supporting commercial facilities for visitor-oriented activities and facilities;
- To provide a transition zone between the Plaza Resort and Specialty Lodging uses within North Village and surrounding residential uses; and
- To provide integrated pedestrian access to and from the plazas.

PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The intent of the proposed project is to create a better relationship and integration with Minaret Road, with a signature street level pedestrian porte cochere and other features that would animate

the streetscape and serve as an inviting portal into the proposed hotel. In a commitment to help the NVSP area realize its place-making potential, the key goals and objectives of the project are to:

- Greatly improve the project's relationship with the streetscape by introducing the porosity that allows for ease of pedestrian integration with Minaret Road;
- Populate and animate this section of Minaret Road and allow for ease of access to and from the proposed hotel amenities via the inviting pedestrian porte cochere;
- Provide streetscape features, including an informational kiosk and a pocket park;
- Deliver much needed critical mass in terms of hot beds to substantively help the North Village achieve economic sustainability;
- Provide an array of services and amenities that make the North Village a much more compelling destination for tourists and locals alike;
- Eliminate the need for any additional curb cuts along Minaret Road, which would be disruptive to pedestrian flows, by utilizing the existing vehicular access to Building C off of Canyon Boulevard;
- Improve the animation and vibrancy of the streetscape along Minaret Road with the addition of terraces for casual gathering or dining;
- Provide an array of amenities and related back-of-the-house functions that would allow for the inn to operate efficiently and attract an experienced and quality hotel operator to reinforce 8050's quality as a compelling year-round destination for visitors and locals alike;
- Deliver a LEED certifiable project consistent with the shared environmental values of the Town and the Applicant;
- Utilize a contextually sensitive architectural vernacular that departs from the repetitive and mostly uninspiring design solutions associated with earlier generation lodging properties within the community;
- Deliver a project that takes into account snow country design issues and constraints; and
- Produce a compelling, iconic, and economically sustainable lodging project that acts as a catalyst for the revitalization and added vibrancy of the North Village.

The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making. The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall also 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. Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, General Plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the

proponent). Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the project's significant effects need be considered for inclusion. An alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative need not be considered.

Only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are relevant in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project. As discussed throughout Section 5.0, *Environmental Analysis*, the proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, as all potential impacts were concluded to be less than significant or reduced to a less than significant levels with implementation of the Town's standards and regulations, the applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures, and/or the recommended Additional Mitigation Measures.

Since no significant and unavoidable impacts were found, all potential environmental impacts that were considered in this SEIR are being analyzed in comparison with the following alternatives:

- No Project/No Development Alternative;
- No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative; and
- Reduced Height Alternative.

Throughout the following analysis, the alternatives' impacts are analyzed for each environmental issues area, as examined in Section 5.0 of this SEIR. In this manner, each alternative can be compared to the proposed project on an issue-by-issue basis. The end of this section provides an overview of the alternatives analyzed and a comparison of each alternative's impact in relation to the proposed project. This section also identifies alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process. Section 7.3, *Environmentally Superior Alternative*, references the "environmentally superior" alternative, as required by the CEQA Guidelines.

7.1 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS

The following is a discussion of the land use alternatives considered during the scoping and planning process and the reasons why they were not selected for detailed analysis in this SEIR. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), 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.

7.1.1 1999 SPEIR ALTERNATIVES

The project site is part of the NVSP. The NVSP was adopted in 1991 and has been amended several times. The NVSP establishes development regulations for approximately 64 acres located around Minaret Road, Main Street/Lake Mary Road, and Canyon Boulevard. The intent of the NVSP is to develop a cohesive, pedestrian-oriented resort activity node, and to provide a year-round focus for visitor activity within the town.

Several projects have been approved under the NVSP, resulting in the development or redevelopment of various properties in the area. One of these projects is the 8050 project (encompassing the project site), which consists of a three-phased development. The certified 1999 SPEIR was found to adequately cover and address the 8050 project. The first two phases of the 8050 project, Buildings A and B, have been completed, as well as the parking structure that would serve all three phases, Buildings A, B, and C. On April 27, 2005, the Planning Commission of the Town of Mammoth Lakes approved Tentative Tract Map 36-229 and Use Permit 2005-01, which approved Building C, the third and final building in the 8050 complex. The requisite building permit was subsequently issued by the Town to allow for construction of the approved Building C, which totaled 41,134 square feet and included 21 residential condominiums with a total of 33 bedrooms. The proposed Inn at the Village project is a redesign of Building C. The analyses that were conducted as part of the 1999 SPEIR that were considered by the Town, but were rejected as infeasible, are discussed below. It encompasses the alternative development scenarios that were considered, and presents the findings of the environmental impact analyses that were conducted.

1999 SPEIR Chapter 7, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*, analyzed the following alternatives to the project or to the location of the project:

- *No Project Alternative*. This alternative consisted of the buildout of the 1994 NVSP. The 1994 NVSP included 41 separate parcels under several separate ownerships, totaling 64.1 acres. It created a set of land use designations and development standards to facilitate the development of the NVSP area as a concentrated, pedestrian-oriented activity center with limited demand for automobile use. Buildout of the 1994 NVSP would have resulted in the development of up to 3,020 accommodation rooms, in addition to affordable housing, and 135,000 square feet of commercial uses. The overall NVSP density would be approximately 54 rooms per acre based on three land use districts, the highest intensity district permitting a maximum of 80 rooms per acre and the lowest intensity district permitting a maximum of 48 rooms per acre. While the proposed types of land uses would be similar between the 1994 and 1999 NVSP Amendment, the orientation and distribution of uses differed with the 1999 NVSP Amendment. Despite the differences in development standards and distribution, the No Project Alternative would fulfill the primary project objectives outlined for the 1999 NVSP Amendment.

- *Reduced Density Alternative*. The Reduced Density Alternative assumed a 30 percent reduction in the overall density (square footage) of the 1999 NVSP Amendment. The density reduction would occur proportionally for all permitted land use types. The overall distribution of uses would remain the same as the 1999 NVSP Amendment. The Reduced Density Alternative would fulfill the primary project objectives for the 1999 NVSP Amendment to a lesser degree because of the reduction in size.

- *Alternative Site Alternative*. The Alternative Site Alternative assumed the construction of the same proposed land uses under the 1999 NVSP Amendment on the Lodestar at Mammoth Master Plan site. The Lodestar at Mammoth site is bordered to the north by Main Street, to the south by Meridian Boulevard and Minaret Road, to the west by Lake Mary Road and to the east by Joaquin Road. In May 1991, a Master Plan for development within the area of Lodestar at Mammoth Master Plan was prepared including land use development standards and conditions of approval for all development. A Final EIR was prepared in February 1991 and subsequently certified in April 17, 1991 for the Master Plan based on construction of a

210-acre master planned destination resort, which includes 40 single-family homes, 735 multi-family condominiums, 100 lodges and apartments (employee housing), 515,600 square feet of full-service hotels, an 80,000 square feet commercial village, and a 110-acre 18-hole golf course. Although the Alternative Site Alternative would result in the same amount and type of development proposed, it would not fulfill the primary project objectives of the 1999 NVSP Amendment to facilitate the development (or renovation) of NVSP area as a concentrated, pedestrian oriented activity center with restricted vehicular access.

Based on the analysis presented in Chapter 7 of the 1999 SPEIR, the No Project Alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative. CEQA Section 15126.6 indicates that if the "No Project" Alternative is the "Environmentally Superior" Alternative, the EIR should also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives. As the Reduced Density Alternative would result in the least environmental impacts when compared to the 1999 NVSP Amendment project while still meeting many of the project objectives and not increasing the significance of anticipated impacts, the Reduced Density Alternative was considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

As these alternatives do not focus analysis on a project-level basis, the three alternatives analyzed in the 1999 SPEIR have been considered, but rejected from further consideration.

7.1.2 ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT AREAS

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(2)(A), the key question and first step in the analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the SEIR. In general, any development of the size and type proposed by the Inn at the Village project would have substantially the same impacts on an environmental basis. Without a site specific analysis, impacts on aesthetics, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, and utilities and service systems cannot be evaluated. However, it could be inferred that other impacts, such as biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, noise, etc., could result in increased impacts, as an alternative site would most likely be undeveloped. The Applicant has a vested right to develop the proposed project on the 8050 Building C project site, pursuant to the building permit issued under the approved Tentative Tract Map 36-229 and Use Permit 2005-01, which approved Building C, the third and final building in the 8050 complex. Although the Applicant does own other properties in the NVSP area, these other properties are not yet entitled for future development (Mammoth Crossing sites located to the south of the project site). Furthermore, it is a key objective of the proposed project, and a key aspect of its design, to enhance pedestrian integration and accessibility while improving animation and vibrancy of the streetscape along Minaret Road at the project site. Consequently, this alternative has been considered and rejected from further analysis.

7.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

Based on the criteria set forth in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 and the new information considered in this SEIR, the "No Project/No Development" Alternative, the "No Project/No Reasonably Foreseeable Development" Alternative, and the "Reduced Height" Alternative were selected and are analyzed in detail in the following sections.

An EIR must identify an "environmentally superior" alternative and where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated. Each alternative's environmental impacts are compared to the proposed project and determined to be environmentally superior, neutral, or inferior. However, only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are used in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project. Section 7.3 identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

7.2.1 "NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT" ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

This alternative assumes that the existing 8050 project would remain in the current state, with Buildings A and B of the project completed as well as the 136-space parking structure that serves the project site. The project site would remain the parking structure podium, and no development would be constructed atop. The seven-story hotel, totaling 64,750 gross square feet that includes up to 67 hotel rooms, food and beverage service, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, lobby, and landscaping elements would not be developed. Under this alternative, the signature pedestrian porte cochere, allowing for pedestrian integration and improved circulation and a visitor serving public kiosk or retail space at street level would not be constructed. Additionally, the existing sidewalk along Minaret Road would not be reconstructed to Town standards.

The following discussion evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with the No Project/No Development Alternative, as compared to the impacts from the proposed project.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Land Use and Relevant Planning

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no development would occur within the existing 8050 project Phase C; therefore, no amendments to the NVSP are proposed under this Alternative. With the No Project/No Development Alternative, the density transfer from the nearby Mammoth Crossing property, the zoning amendment to increase the maximum permitted height, and the zoning amendment to reduce the front yard setback area would not be required. Therefore, the project's proposed density transfer and NVSP amendments would not be implemented. In addition, new land use approvals and permits including a Tentative Tract Map, Conditional Use Permit; Design Review Permit; and Final Map, among others would not be required.

Although the No Project/No Development Alternative would not require amendments to the NVSP, this Alternative would also not implement some of the policies and objectives of the General Plan and NVSP, which identify the need to provide integrated pedestrian access to and from the plazas, provide a variety of resort oriented lodging and limited commercial uses, and provide convenient, safe pedestrian connections to the rest of the North Village area, transit facilities, and ski lifts, and to provide animated streets with pedestrian amenities. Therefore, the No project/No Development Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project regarding land use and relevant planning.

Aesthetics

The existing visual character of the project site is illustrated on the following exhibits: Exhibit 5.2-2, *Existing Character of the Project Site*, Exhibit 5.2-4, *Key View 1 - Existing Condition*; and Exhibit 5.2-5, *Key View 2 - Existing Condition*. The short-term visual impacts associated with demolition, grading, paving, and construction activities that would occur with the proposed project would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative. Therefore, the project's construction-related impacts to the visual character/quality of the project site and its surroundings would be avoided.

The project site's long-term visual character would be altered with the proposed project, as a new 67-room hotel would be constructed on top of the existing parking structure podium. The new structure would extend 18 feet or more above the surrounding structures, with the exception of the Westin, to the west, which is of similar height. Further, the upper floors of the new structure would appear to slightly encroach more onto Minaret Road as a result of the proposed setback reductions. No increased view blockage, compared to that analyzed in the 1999 SPEIR would occur. Pedestrian features (i.e., pedestrian porte cochere, improved sidewalk, landscaping, public kiosk, and public pocket park) would be constructed along Minaret Road in order to increase the pedestrian-friendly scale of the environment and connectivity within the NVSP area. The project site's shade and shadow patterns would be altered with the proposed project, as the new hotel development would cast new shadows on nearby public streets and sidewalks.

The long-term visual character of the project site and surrounding area would not be altered with the No Project/No Development Alternative, as no new development would occur and the project site would remain in its current condition. No increased building heights or reduced setbacks would occur on-site. Pedestrian improvements along Minaret Road would not be constructed. The existing shade and shadows patterns would not be altered with the No Project/No Development Alternative. Although the project would result in less than significant impacts to scenic views, visual character/quality, light/glare, and shade/shadow patterns with implementation of the 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures and recommended Additional Mitigation Measures, the No Project/No Development Alternative would avoid all impacts in this regard.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding aesthetics/light and glare, given it would avoid impacts to scenic views/vistas, short-term visual character/quality, long-term visual character/quality, light/glare, and shade/shadow.

Traffic/Circulation

Existing peak hour intersection and roadway operating conditions were evaluated in the Traffic Study; refer to Section 5.3, *Traffic/Circulation*. All study intersections and roadway segments are currently operating at an acceptable level of service (LOS) (LOS D or better) with the exception of Canyon Boulevard north of Lake Mary Road (LOS F) during the peak hours based on the Town of Mammoth Lakes and Caltrans analysis methodologies and performance criteria. These existing conditions would continue with the No Project/No Development Alternative, similar to the proposed project. Project implementation would result in less than significant impacts at intersections. The increase in average daily traffic (ADT) projected to occur with the proposed project would not occur with this Alternative, as the proposed project would not be developed. Therefore, although less than significant, the project's impacts to study area intersections and roadways would be avoided.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding traffic and circulation, given it would result in no increase in ADT and no traffic impacts at intersections or roadways.

Noise

Construction noise associated with the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts, with mitigation incorporated, regarding exposure to surrounding sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the established standards. Construction activities would cause less than significant increased mobile noise along access routes to and from the site due to movement of equipment and workers. The project's construction-related vibration impacts are also anticipated to be less than significant. Construction-related short-term noise and vibration impacts would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative. Therefore, the short-term construction-related noise and vibration impacts that would occur with the proposed project would be avoided with this Alternative.

Existing modeled noise levels would range from 59.1 dBA to 65.6 dBA at 100 feet from the roadway centerline. These existing conditions would continue with the No Project/No Development Alternative, although these existing conditions may be impacted by additional growth in the area. Project implementation would result in less than significant impacts from mobile noise sources. The increase in ADT projected to occur with the proposed project would not occur with this Alternative, as the proposed hotel and accessory uses would not be developed. Therefore, although less than significant, the project's long-term noise impacts from mobile sources would be avoided.

These existing conditions would continue with the No Project/No Development Alternative. Project implementation would result in less than significant impacts from stationary noise sources. The increased noise from the proposed project, which would be typical of commercial, retail, and hotel uses, would not occur with this Alternative, because the proposed hotel and accessory uses would not be developed. Therefore, although less than significant, the project's long-term noise impacts from stationary sources would be avoided.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding noise, since it would result in no short-term construction-related or long-term operational mobile or stationary source noise impacts.

Air Quality

Table 5.5-5, *Maximum Daily Pollutant Emissions During Construction*, presents the project's anticipated daily short-term construction emissions and indicates that impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation. Short-term air quality impacts from demolition, grading, and construction activities would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative. Therefore, the short-term air quality impacts that would occur with the proposed project would be avoided with this Alternative.

The proposed project would not exceed the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District's (MDAQMD) emissions thresholds (utilized since the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District [GBUAPCD] does not currently have a preferred methodology), as indicated in Table 5.5-6, *Long-Term Operational Air Emissions*. Additionally, the project would not result in CO hotspots at any of the study intersections. Long-term air quality impacts from mobile and area source pollutant emissions would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative. Therefore, the air quality emissions that would occur with the proposed project would be avoided with this Alternative.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding air quality, given it would result in no short- or long-term air quality impacts.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As indicated in Table 5.6-1, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, project implementation would result in 738.57 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year ($MTCO_2eq/yr$), which is below the 900 $MTCO_2eq/yr$ threshold. Thus, less than significant short-term and operational greenhouse gas (GHG) emission impacts would occur with the proposed project. GHG emissions from construction and operational activities would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative. Therefore, the GHG emissions that would occur with the proposed project would be avoided with this Alternative.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding GHG emissions, since no GHG emissions would occur.

Utilities and Service Systems

Implementation of the proposed project would place increased demands upon utilities and service systems consisting of water and wastewater (sewers). The No Project/No Development Alternative would result in none of the impacts associated with increased demands upon utilities and service systems, because no new land uses would be developed. Therefore, the increased demands upon utilities and service systems that would occur with the proposed project would be avoided with this Alternative.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding utilities and service systems, given no impacts to utilities and service systems would occur.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not attain most of the project's basic objectives. This Alternative would not meet the Town's goals and objectives pertaining to creating a sense of exploration using pedestrian-oriented sidewalks, plazas, and courtyards with pedestrian comforts; a visitor-oriented entertainment retail district; active day and evening through all four seasons, designed to achieve a two to three hour visit; resort and resident activities, amenities, and services; animation with retail and significant businesses oriented to the street; retail and services in "storefront" setting located at the sidewalk; and a variety of resort lodging supported by meeting facilities, outdoor activities, and restaurants, arts, culture, and entertainment.

The goals and objectives of the NVSP would not be fully realized with implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative. This Alternative would not provide resort accommodations and supporting commercial facilities for visitor-oriented activities and facilities or integrated pedestrian access to and from the plazas.

This Alternative would not meet many of the project's objectives, including the objectives to construct a compelling, iconic, and economically sustainable lodging development that would revitalize and enhance vibrancy to the NVSP area by providing greater pedestrian integration and accessibility for tourists and locals. An array of services and amenities including dining, casual gathering places, publically accessible landscaped spaces, and visitor accommodations for the residents and visitors of the Town would not be provided at the project site. The No Project/No Development Alternative would also not achieve economic sustainability by creating Town revenue through transient occupancy tax.

7.2.2 "NO PROJECT/ REASONABLY FORESEEABLE DEVELOPMENT" ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative proposes the development of new private residential condominiums on the project site as currently permitted (the approved 8050 Building C), which would total 41,134 square feet including 21 residential condominiums with a total of 33 bedrooms and would be five stories (62 feet) in height. The development associated with this alternative would have a broader building mass, covering the entire existing parking structure podium. The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would be consistent with the NVSP and amendments would not be required.

Table 7-1, *Comparison of Proposed Project and No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative*, compares the land use type and overall building height of the proposed project and the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative. Comparatively, this alternative proposes 21 residential condominiums with 33 rooms, resulting in a difference in land use type and a decrease of 23,616 square feet from the proposed project. This Alternative would not require a density transfer from the Mammoth Crossing zone. In addition, this Alternative proposes a maximum height of five stories (62 feet) plus another three feet for roof appurtenances, a decrease of 18 feet and an additional one foot, six inches for roof appurtenances from the proposed project. The Alternative's maximum height would be consistent with the current NVSP. As this Alternative has a

wide building mass, this Alternative would have increased building footprint that increases the proposed building massing along the adjacent Fireside at the Village condominiums to the south. Under the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, the architecture and landscaping components would be developed as residential condominiums (with fractional ownership) similar to the existing 8050 Buildings A and B. In addition, the remaining accessory components (i.e., food and beverage service, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, lobby, and pedestrian porte-cochere) would not be developed, since this Alternative would not function as a more traditional hotel operation.

Table 7-1
Comparison of Proposed Project and No Project/ Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative

Land Use	Proposed Project	No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative
Hotel Rooms[1]	34,840 square feet (67 rooms)	-
Accessory Uses (e.g., lobby, circulation, etc.)	29,910 square feet	-
Residential Condominiums	-	41,134 square feet (21 residential condominiums, 33 rooms)
Building Height	80 feet[2]	62 feet[3]

Notes:
1. The hotel proposes rooms that would be approximately +/- 520 square feet per room.
2. Building height for the proposed project excludes an additional 4 feet and 6 inches for roof appurtenances.
3. Building height for the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative excludes an additional 3 feet for roof appurtenances.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Land Use and Relevant Planning

Under the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, the project site would be developed with the current permitted 8050 Building C, allowed under the current NVSP. No amendments to the NVSP would be required. Given the previous permits and approvals obtained for the 8050 Building C, the No Project/Reasonable Foreseeable Development Alternative would not require the land use approvals and permits, as these were already obtained. Therefore, the project's proposed NVSP amendments, land use approvals and permits including a Tentative Tract Map, Conditional Use Permit; Design Review Permit; and Final Map required for the proposed project, would not be implemented under the No Project/Reasonable Foreseeable Development Alternative.

Although the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would not require amendments to the NVSP, this Alternative would also not implement some of the policies and objectives of the General Plan and NVSP, which identify the need to provide integrated pedestrian access to and from the plazas and provide convenient, safe pedestrian connections to the rest of the

North Village area, transit facilities, and ski lifts, and to provide animated streets with pedestrian amenities. Therefore, the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project regarding land use and relevant planning.

Aesthetics/Light and Glare

The short-term visual impacts associated with demolition, grading, paving and construction activities that would occur with the proposed project would similarly occur with the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, although to a lesser extent. Further, the anticipated time of construction would be slightly reduced, given the reduced square footage proposed.

The project site's long-term visual character would be altered with this Alternative, as the new private residential condominiums would be built on top of the existing parking structure podium (similar to that analyzed as part of the 1999 SPEIR). Impacts to view blockage of the Sherwin Range would be similar to that considered for the proposed project. However, the long-term visual character of the project site and its surroundings would be reduced with the No Project/ Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, as the on-site development would appear similar in form and building height to the adjoining uses (Fireside at the Village condominiums and the existing 8050 Buildings A and B). However, pedestrian features (i.e., pedestrian porte cochere, improved sidewalk, landscaping, public kiosk, and public pocket park) would not be constructed along Minaret Road, which would not be consistent with the intent of the 2007 General Plan, NVSP, and NVSP Design Guidelines. As depicted in Exhibit 5.2-9a, *Proposed Summer Shadow Patterns*, Exhibit 5.2-9b, *Proposed Winter Shadow Patterns*, and Exhibit 5.2-9c, *Proposed Vernal/Autumnal Shadow Patterns*, shade and shadows patterns would be slightly reduced with the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, since the proposed building would be three stories lower. As with the proposed project, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures.

The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding aesthetics/light and glare impacts as it would reduce the building heights similar to the surrounding area, be located below the surrounding tree canopy, and would slightly reduce impacts from shadow patterns in the area.

Traffic/Circulation

The proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 19 peak hour trips for a typical weekend. Under the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, the project site would be developed with 41,134 square feet of residential condominium units (with fractional ownership), instead of the proposed 64,750 square-foot hotel and accessory uses. During peak travel times such as a typical winter weekend, both the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative and the proposed project could reach maximum occupancy levels. Given the residential condominiums would result in fewer occupants and less vehicular travel than the proposed project, this Alternative would result in a decrease in ADT, compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a decrease in traffic when compared to the proposed project.

Comparatively, the traffic and circulation impacts under the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would be less than the proposed project, given this Alternative would have compatible uses but less development intensity as the proposed project. Therefore, the less than significant traffic and circulation impacts that would occur with the proposed project would be further reduced with this Alternative.

The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding traffic and circulation impacts due to decreased traffic volumes.

Noise

Construction noise associated with the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts, with mitigation incorporated, regarding exposure to surrounding sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the established standards. Construction activities would cause less than significant increased mobile noise along access routes to and from the site due to movement of equipment and workers. The project's construction-related vibration impacts are also anticipated to be less than significant. Short-term noise impacts would occur with the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative due to construction of the proposed residential condominiums. Comparatively, this Alternative's construction-related noise impacts would be similar to the proposed project, given this Alternative would result in a similar disturbance area. Therefore, the less than significant (with mitigation incorporated) short-term noise impacts that would occur with the proposed project would occur also with this Alternative.

Long-term noise impacts from vehicular travel on the surrounding roadway network would occur with the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, although to a lesser degree than the proposed project. Comparatively, this Alternative's mobile source noise impacts would be less than the proposed project, given this Alternative would decrease the ADT compared to the proposed project. During peak travel times (such as a typical winter weekend), both the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development and the proposed project could reach maximum occupancy levels. As the residential condominiums would result in fewer occupants and less vehicular travel than the proposed project, the mobile source noise impacts that would occur with the proposed project would occur also with this Alternative, although to a lesser degree.

Project implementation would result in less than significant impacts from stationary noise sources associated with the proposed project, since the resultant noise would be typical of the surrounding visitor-oriented resort uses. With the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development, 21 residential condominiums would operate on the project site, generating noise levels from new stationary sources, including mechanical equipment, and delivery activities, among others. Comparatively, the stationary source noise impacts under the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would be less than the proposed project, given this Alternative would have compatible uses but less development intensity as the proposed project. Therefore, the stationary source noise impacts that would occur with the proposed project would occur also with this Alternative, however, to a lesser degree.

The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding noise impacts due to decreased mobile and stationary noise levels.

Air Quality

Table 5.5-5, *Maximum Daily Construction Emissions*, presents the project's anticipated daily short-term construction emissions and indicates that less than significant impacts would occur in this regard. Short-term air quality impacts from demolition, grading, construction, and paving activities would occur with the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative. Comparatively, the construction-related air quality impacts would be similar to the proposed project, given ground-disturbing activities would occur within a similar development footprint. Therefore, the short-term air quality impacts that would occur with the proposed project would be similar under this Alternative.

The proposed project would not exceed the MDAQMD's emissions thresholds, as indicated in Table 5.5-6, *Long-Term Operational Air Emissions*. Additionally, the project would not result in CO hotspots at any of the study intersections. Long-term air quality impacts from mobile and area source pollutant emissions would occur with the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, although to a lesser degree than the proposed project. During peak travel times (such as a typical winter weekend), both the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development and the proposed project could reach maximum occupancy levels. As a result, this Alternative would result in a decrease in ADT compared to the proposed project, as this Alternative would result in fewer occupants and fewer vehicle trips. With this Alternative, proportionately less long-term air quality impacts from mobile pollutant emissions would occur compared to the proposed project.

The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding air quality impacts due to decreased mobile source emissions.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As indicated in Table 5.6-1, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, project implementation would result in 738.57 $MTCO_2eq/yr$, which is below the 900 $MTCO_2eq/yr$ threshold. Thus, less than significant short-term and operational GHG emission impacts would occur with the proposed project. GHG emissions from construction and operational activities would also occur with the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, although to a lesser degree than the proposed project. During peak travel times (such as a typical winter weekend), both the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development and the proposed project could reach maximum occupancy levels. As such, this Alternative would result in a decrease in ADT compared to the proposed project, as this Alternative would result in fewer occupants and a reduction in vehicle trips. The combined construction and operational GHG emissions would also result in similar less than significant impacts from a cumulative perspective under this Alternative, although to a lesser degree than the proposed project.

The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding GHG emissions, due to decreased mobile emissions.

Utilities and Service Systems

Implementation of the proposed project would place increased demands upon utilities and service systems (i.e., wastewater and water). The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated with increased demands upon utilities and service systems, as this Alternative would have reduced development intensity at the project site. Therefore, the less than significant increased demands upon utilities and service systems that would occur with the proposed project would occur also with this Alternative.

The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding impacts to utilities and service systems, since less development intensity would occur compared to the proposed project.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would only attain some, but not all, of the project's objectives. This alternative would result in 21 residential condominiums with 33 rooms, but would eliminate the accessory components related to hotel uses including the food and beverage service, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, and pedestrian porte-cochere, public kiosk, and public pocket park. As a result, the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would not meet the Town's goals and objectives pertaining to creating a sense of exploration using pedestrian-oriented sidewalks, plazas, and courtyards with pedestrian comforts; a visitor-oriented entertainment retail district; active day and evening through all four seasons, designed to achieve a two to three hour visit; resort and resident activities, amenities, and services; animation with retail and significant businesses oriented to the street; retail and services in "storefront" setting located at the sidewalk; and a variety of resort lodging supported by meeting facilities, outdoor activities, and restaurants, arts, culture, and entertainment.

The goals and objectives of the NVSP would not be fully realized with implementation of the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative. This Alternative would not provide facilities or integrated pedestrian access to and from the plazas. Implementation of the No Project/ Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would not meet most of the project's basic objectives. This Alternative would not enhance pedestrian integration and amenities. Dining, casual gathering places, publically accessible landscaped spaces, and hotel-type visitor accommodations for the residents and visitors of the Town would not be provided at the project site. The No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would create Town revenue through fractional ownership taxes and assessments, although would not provide the fullest extent of economic sustainability compared to the proposed project. Therefore, unlike the proposed project, this alternative would only partially achieve the project objectives.

7.2.3 "REDUCED HEIGHT" ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Height Alternative proposes the development of a hotel use (with option for condominium or fractional ownership) on the project site that would have 56 hotel rooms and would be five stories (58 feet) in height. This alternative would have the same building footprint,

architecture, and landscaping elements as the proposed project. However, this alternative would have a loss of amenities including the food and beverage service, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, and pedestrian porte-cochere, as this alternative would not function as a more traditional hotel. The development associated with this alternative would still be built on top of the existing parking structure podium; however, the proposed outdoor pool/jacuzzi area would instead be utilized to accommodate outdoor patios for condominium units and modest landscape features. Under the Reduced Height Alternative, the NVSP would need to be amended to increase the allowable development density for the project site (a transfer of 19 rooms from one of the Mammoth Crossing sites [MC zone]). However, amendments pertaining to building heights and setbacks would not be required.

Table 7-2, *Comparison of Proposed Project and Reduced Height Alternative*, compares the overall density, building height, and average daily trips of the proposed project and Reduced Height Alternative. Comparatively, this Alternative proposes a 16.4 percent decrease in hotel units, with 11 fewer hotel rooms, resulting in a decrease in the allowable development density transfer of 19 rooms from the Mammoth Crossing zone. This Alternative would also decrease three peak hour trips. In addition, the Reduced Height Alternative proposes a maximum height of five stories (58 feet) with an additional 4 feet, 6 inches for roof appurtenances, a decrease of 22 feet from the proposed project. The proposed maximum height would be consistent with the current NVSP. As the proposed maximum height decreases, the proposed building also conforms to the building setback requirements in the Resort General (RG) zone. Under the Reduced Height Alternative, the architecture and landscaping components would be developed similar to the proposed project. However, the remaining accessory components (i.e., food and beverage service, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, pedestrian porte-cochere, public pocket park, and public kiosk) would not be developed.

Table 7-2
Comparison of Proposed Project and Reduced Height Alternative

Land Use	Proposed Project	Reduced Height Alternative	Difference
Hotel[1]	34,840 square feet (67 rooms)	29,120 square feet (56 rooms)	-5,720 square feet (-11 rooms)
Accessory Uses (i.e., circulation)	29,910 square feet	24,135 square feet	-5,775 square feet
Building Height[2]	80 feet	58 feet	-22 feet
Peak Hour Trips[3]	19	16	-3

Notes:
1. The hotel proposes rooms that would be approximately +/- 520 square feet per room.
2. Building height excludes an additional 4 feet and 6 inches for roof appurtenances.
3. Based on a trip generation rate of 0.28 trips per occupied unit per *The Inn at the Village Project – Traffic Analysis,* dated May 8, 2014.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Land Use and Relevant Planning

Under the Reduced Height Alternative, a hotel (with option for condominium or fractional ownership) would occur on-site. The NVSP would still need to be amended with the Reduced

Height Alternative, but to a lesser degree than the proposed project. With the Reduced Height Alternative, the NVSP would require an amendment to allow for a density transfer from the nearby Mammoth Crossing zone. Due to the reduced height of the Alternative, the NVSP amendments associated with the project concerning the maximum height and reduced building setbacks would not be required, as this Alternative would be consistent with the current NVSP in this regard.

As the NVSP would still require an amendment for the increased density at this site, this Alternative would also require land use approvals and permits including a District Zoning Amendment, Tentative Tract Map Conditional Use Permit, Design Review Permit, and Final Map, similar to the proposed project.

The Reduced Height Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project regarding land use and relevant planning, given that it would reduce the number of required amendments to the NVSP, but not meeting the many of the policies and objectives of the General Plan and NVSP, particularly regarding increased pedestrian connectivity along Minaret Road.

Aesthetics/Light and Glare

The short-term visual impacts associated with demolition, grading, paving, and construction activities that would occur with the proposed project would similarly occur with the Reduced Height Alternative, although to a lesser extent. Further, the anticipated time of construction would be slightly reduced, given the reduced square footage proposed.

The project site's long-term visual character would be altered with this Alternative, as the new hotel would be constructed on top of the existing parking structure podium. Impacts to view blockage of the Sherwin Range would be similar to that considered for the proposed project. However, the long-term visual character of the project site and its surroundings would be reduced with the Reduced Height Alternative, as the on-site development would appear similar in building height to the adjoining uses (Fireside at the Village condominiums and the existing 8050 Buildings A and B). However, pedestrian amenities (i.e., pedestrian porte cochere, public kiosk, and public pocket park) and an active street frontage associated with the food and beverage service terraces would not be achieved along Minaret Road, which would not be consistent with the intent of the 2007 General Plan, NVSP, and NVSP Design Guidelines. The shade and shadows patterns of the Reduced Height Alternative would be slightly reduced, compared to the proposed project, and similar to that considered in the 1999 SPEIR, as the proposed building heights would be allowed under the NVSP. Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures.

The Reduced Height Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding aesthetics/light and glare, given that it would result in reduced building heights more consistent with the adjoining development, situated below the surrounding tree canopy, and reduced shadow patterns in the area compared to the proposed project. However, it should be noted that the lack of pedestrian features and an active street front along Minaret Road would not be consistent with the intent of the 2007 General Plan, NVSP, and NVSP Design Guidelines.

Traffic/Circulation

Under the Reduced Height Alternative, a 56-room hotel (with an option for condominium or fractional ownership) would be developed in place of the project's proposed 67-room hotel. Table 7-2, presents the forecast daily traffic volumes for the Reduced Height Alternative for a typical weekday, and indicates this Alternative is forecast to generate approximately 16 peak hour trips. Therefore, this Alternative would have three fewer peak hour trips than the proposed project.

In addition, the Reduced Height Alternative is forecast to generate approximately 16 percent fewer peak hour trips (or three fewer peak hour trips), when compared to the proposed project. Comparatively, the traffic and circulation impacts under the Reduced Height Alternative would be slightly less than the proposed project, given this Alternative would decrease the ADT by 3 fewer peak hour trips. Therefore, the less-than-significant traffic and circulation impacts would be similar to that considered for the proposed project.

The Reduced Height Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project regarding traffic and circulation impacts due to the nominal reduction in traffic volumes.

Noise

Construction noise associated with the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts, with mitigation incorporated, regarding exposure to surrounding sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the established standards. Construction activities would cause less than significant increased mobile noise along access routes to and from the site due to movement of equipment and workers. The project's construction-related vibration impacts are also anticipated to be less than significant. Short-term noise impacts from demolition, grading, and construction activities would occur with the Reduced Height Alternative due to construction of the proposed buildings and improvements. Comparatively, this Alternative's construction-related noise impacts would be similar to the proposed project, given this Alternative would result in a similar development footprint. Therefore, the less than significant (with mitigation incorporated) short-term noise impacts that would occur with the proposed project would occur also with this Alternative.

Long-term noise impacts from vehicular travel on the surrounding roadway network would occur with the Reduced Height Alternative, although to a slightly lesser degree than the proposed project. Comparatively, this Alternative's mobile source noise impacts would be nominally less than the proposed project, given this Alternative would decrease ADT by approximately 16 percent (three fewer peak hour trips). Therefore, the overall mobile source noise impacts that would occur with the proposed project would occur also with this Alternative.

Project implementation would result in less than significant impacts from stationary noise sources associated with the proposed project, since the resultant noise would be typical of the surrounding visitor-oriented resort uses. With the Reduced Height Alternative, a new 56-room hotel (with option for condominium or fractional ownership) would operate on the project site, generating noise levels from new stationary sources, including parking lots, mechanical equipment, and loading/unloading areas, among others. Comparatively, the stationary source noise impacts under the Reduced Height Alternative would be nominally less than the proposed project, given this

Alternative would have less rooms and less vehicle trips (three fewer peak hour trips) than the proposed project. Therefore, the overall stationary source noise impacts that would occur with the proposed project would occur also with this Alternative.

The Reduced Height Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project regarding noise impacts due to the nominal decreased mobile and stationary noise levels.

Air Quality

Table 5.5-5, *Maximum Daily Construction Emissions*, presents the project's anticipated daily short-term construction emissions and indicates that less than significant impacts would occur in this regard. Short-term air quality impacts from demolition, grading, construction, and paving activities would also occur with the Reduced Height Alternative. Comparatively, the construction-related air quality impacts would be nominally less than the proposed project, given ground-disturbing activities would occur within a similar development footprint. Therefore, the short-term air quality impacts that would occur with the proposed project would be similar under this Alternative.

The proposed project would not exceed the MDAQMD's emissions thresholds, as indicated in Table 5.5-6, *Long-Term Operational Air Emissions*. Additionally, the project would not result in CO hotspots at any of the study intersections. Long-term air quality impacts from mobile and area source pollutant emissions would occur with the Reduced Height Alternative, although to a slightly lesser degree than the proposed project. This Alternative would result in fewer rooms and fewer vehicle trips (three fewer peak hour trips), as compared to the proposed project. With this Alternative, proportionately less long-term air quality impacts from mobile pollutant emissions would occur (approximately 16 percent less, which would be a nominal reduction since only three fewer vehicles would occur), as compared to the proposed project.

The Reduced Height Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project regarding air quality impacts due to the nominal decreased mobile source emissions.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As indicated in Table 5.6-1, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, project implementation would result in 738.57 $MTCO_2eq/yr$, which is below the 900 $MTCO_2eq/yr$ threshold. Thus, less than significant short-term and operational GHG emission impacts would occur with the proposed project. GHG emissions from construction and operational activities would also occur with the Reduced Height Alternative, although to a slightly lesser degree (a nominal decrease of three peak hour trips), than the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the combined construction and operational GHG emissions would also result in less than significant impacts from a cumulative perspective under this Alternative, although only a nominal reduction compared to the proposed project.

The Reduced Height Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project regarding GHG emissions, due to the nominal decreased mobile emissions.

Utilities and Service Systems

Implementation of the proposed project would place increased demands upon utilities and service systems (i.e., wastewater and water). The Reduced Height Alternative would result in similar impacts associated with increased demands upon utilities and service systems, because a new hotel would be developed. Therefore, the less than significant increased demands upon utilities and service systems that would occur with the proposed project would occur also with this Alternative.

The Reduced Height Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project regarding impacts to utilities and service systems, given that it would be a similar use and it would have similar impacts as the proposed project.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

By reducing the height, this Alternative would result in 56 rooms but eliminate the accessory components including the food and beverage service, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, and pedestrian porte-cochere. implementation of this Alternative would not attain most of the Town's goals and objectives, including those pertaining to creating a sense of exploration using pedestrian-oriented sidewalks, plazas, and courtyards with pedestrian comforts; a visitor-oriented entertainment retail district; active day and evening through all four seasons, designed to achieve a two to three hour visit; resort and resident activities, amenities, and services; animation with retail and significant businesses oriented to the street; retail and services in "storefront" setting located at the sidewalk; and a variety of resort lodging supported by meeting facilities, outdoor activities, and restaurants, arts, culture, and entertainment.

The goals and objectives of the NVSP would not be fully realized with implementation of the Reduced Height Alternative. This Alternative would not provide desired facilities.

Last, implementation of the Reduced Height Alternative would only meet some, but not all of the project's objectives. The Reduced Height Alternative would not attain enhanced pedestrian integration and amenities. Dining, casual gathering places, and publically accessible landscaped spaces would not be provided on the project site. The Reduced Height Alternative would create Town revenue through transient occupancy tax, although not to the extent of the proposed project. Therefore, unlike the proposed project, this Alternative would not fully act as a catalyst for the revitalization and added vibrancy of the NVSP area.

7.3 "ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR" ALTERNATIVE

Table 7-3, *Comparison of Alternatives*, summarizes the comparative analysis presented above (i.e., the alternatives compared to the proposed project). Review of Table 7-3 and the analysis presented above indicates the No Project/No Development and No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative are the environmentally superior alternatives, as these alternatives would avoid or lessen impacts associated with development of the proposed project. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e), *"No Project" Alternative*, "if the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives." Accordingly, the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Alternative is

the environmentally superior alternative. However, this alternative would not achieve most of the project objectives.

Table 7-3
Comparison of Alternatives

Sections	No Project/ No Development	No Project/ Reasonably Foreseeable Development	Reduced Height
Land Use and Relevant Planning	=	=	=
Aesthetics/Light and Glare	↓	↓	↓
Traffic/Circulation	↓	↓	=
Noise	↓	↓	=
Air Quality	↓	↓	=
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	↓	↓	=
Utilities and Service Systems	↓	↓	=

↑ Indicates an impact that is greater than the proposed Project (environmentally inferior).
↓ Indicates an impact that is less than the proposed Project (environmentally superior).
= Indicates an impact that is equal to the proposed Project (neither environmentally superior nor inferior).
* Indicates a significant and unavoidable impact.

Only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are relevant in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project. As discussed throughout Section 5.0, *Environmental Analysis*, the proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, as all potential impacts were concluded to be less than significant or reduced to a less than significant levels with implementation of the Town's standards and regulations, the applicable 1999 SPEIR Mitigation Measures, and/or the recommended Additional Mitigation Measures. Thus, although the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would reduce environmental impacts, which would be considered environmental superior to the proposed project, this Alternative would not reduce any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts.

Further, the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would result in the elimination of the accessory components including the food and beverage service, spa, outdoor pool/jacuzzis, lobby, pedestrian porte-cochere, public kiosk, and public pocket park. This Alternative would not attain most of the Town's goals and objectives, including those pertaining to creating a sense of exploration using pedestrian-oriented sidewalks, plazas, and courtyards with pedestrian comforts; a visitor-oriented entertainment retail district; active day and evening through all four seasons, designed to achieve a two to three hour visit; resort and resident activities, amenities, and services; animation with retail and significant businesses oriented to the street; retail and services in "storefront" setting located at the sidewalk; and a variety of resort lodging supported by meeting facilities, outdoor activities, and restaurants, arts, culture, and entertainment. The goals and objectives of the NVSP would not be fully realized with this Alternative, as it would not provide facilities or integrated pedestrian access to and from the plazas. Further, only some of the project's objectives would be met. Dining, casual gathering places, publically accessible landscaped spaces, and hotel-type visitor accommodations for the residents and visitors of the Town would not be

provided on the project site. Therefore, unlike the proposed project, the No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would not fully act as a catalyst for the revitalization, economic sustainability, and added vibrancy of the NVSP area.

This page intentionally left blank.