5.0 ALTERNATIVES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed project includes analysis of project alternatives to the proposed project. The alternatives analyzed include the following:

- Alternative 1: Event Center Only
- Alternative 2: Smaller Alumni Camp
- No Project Alternative

In addition, the Draft EIR presents several alternatives that were considered initially but have subsequently been rejected based on infeasibility related to technical, legal, financial, or other substantive reasons including the inability to meet basic project objectives.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to describe and evaluate a range of alternatives to the proposed project, or alternatives to the location of the proposed project. The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to explore ways that the objectives of the proposed project could be attained while reducing or avoiding significant environmental impacts of the project as proposed. This process is intended to foster informed decision making and public participation in the environmental process.

5.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The following specific objectives of the alumni camp and environmental education center detail the site planning, programming, financial and operational objectives of the project:

- Create an alumni family camp on property with a water feature such as a lake, stream, or river that would allow water recreation opportunities.
- Provide seclusion within a separate special place for visitors to appreciate and treasure.
- Minimize driving distance from Davis, Sacramento, and San Francisco. Remain within a 2.5 hour drive from Davis to facilitate management of the property and employment opportunities for students.
- Operate a camp that is free from poison oak and at an elevation that is not subject to the extreme heat of the Central Valley in order to provide the highest quality camp experience.
• Provide a full-service camp experience with an adequate revenue base to support dining, lodging, and activities included in the design and operation of the camp.
• Operate a camp primarily during summer months to match vacation planning goals of alumni but also generate income from other activities during non-summer months.
• Operate an alumni camp for a diverse range of interests including people interested in active, passive, independent, or highly facilitated vacation activities that will appeal to a wide range of ages.
• Operate a camp based on a one-week stay scheduled from Sunday arrival to Saturday departure to allow visitors to maximize the amount of vacationing time with minimal time missed at work.
• Operate a camp with unique opportunities for learning about natural and human history.
• Minimize environmental impacts through site selection, camp design, and camp operation.
• Utilize development and construction methods that respect the natural environment.
• Provide long-term stewardship of natural features and human historical features.

In addition, the following objectives were identified as items that are specifically not desired and would not be included in camp operations. These are identified here in the project description for the environmental review in order to exclude certain activities that could result in particular environmental impacts. Items excluded from camp operation are: pets, equestrian activities, firearms, motorized boats or all-terrain vehicle recreation, and hunting.

In addition to an alumni camp, the size of the Crystal Lake property and the presence of the existing large home represent an opportunity to improve the financial viability of the proposed project and support off-season use of the property. The existing large home could be used for events such as weddings, executive professional conferences, retreats, academic conferences, and other gatherings for groups of 15 to 50 people. Specific project objectives of these uses are the following:

• Hosting conferences and events.
• Provide an event venue that is separate from the alumni camp and environmental learning center.
• Utilize the existing main house to provide additional income for the management and operation of the property.

5.3 RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The range of alternatives studied in the EIR must be broad enough to permit a reasoned choice by decision-makers when considering the merits of the project. The analysis should focus on alternatives
that are feasible, i.e., that may be accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time; and that take economic, environmental, social, and technological factors into account. Alternatives that are remote or speculative will not be discussed.

Furthermore, the alternatives analyzed for a project should focus on reducing or avoiding significant environmental impacts associated with the project as proposed. Implementation of the proposed project would result in potentially significant environmental impacts to aesthetics, forestry, air quality, aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, and noise. Most potentially significant impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels through incorporation of mitigation measures. However, the project would have residual significant impacts, identified as significant and unavoidable, with regards to air quality, cultural resources, land use, and noise.

The analysis below presents the alternatives that were considered for this project. As required by State CEQA Guidelines, a No Project Alternative is also analyzed. Each alternative is examined for feasibility of implementation, ability to meet project objectives, and ability to reduce environmental impacts of the proposed project.

5.4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED AS INFEASIBLE

This section discusses alternatives that were considered for the project but were rejected because they did not meet project objectives or were found to be infeasible for technical, environmental, or social reasons.

5.4.1 Alternative Off-Site Location

Under this alternative, a new project site could be considered for construction and operation of the proposed facilities. The UC Davis Cal Aggie Alumni Association conducted a planning effort to determine siting objectives and then searched for approximately 18 months to select a preferred site. The siting objectives, along with the other project objectives, are listed above in Section 5.2. The siting objectives that were primary factors in site selection included distance to UC Davis, avoidance of poison oak, access to a significant water feature, such as a lake, stream, or river that would allow water recreation opportunities, seclusion, and property size large enough to accommodate large groups. Although these items were primary factors, all of the objectives listed in Section 5.2 were influential in the site evaluation and site selection process.

To assist with the site selection process, a real estate broker specializing in large rural properties guided the search. During the search period, more than 12 properties were evaluated and considered. Examples of the properties rejected include existing scout camps, existing church camps, rural undeveloped
5.0 Alternatives

properties with no amenities, lodge facilities within areas of vacation residential developments, properties at lower elevations, and properties in excess of three hours from UC Davis.

Based on this examination, an off-site alternative was determined to be infeasible because large properties with a significant water feature and capable of supporting camp development with low environmental impacts are difficult to find. Most such properties are more than three hours from UC Davis and are frequently four or more hours away. This alternative was determined to be infeasible because waiting for a potential alternative site to become available could result in a lengthy delay of five to 10 years which would conflict with the project objective of creating the desired camp facilities in the current timeline. Since selecting the property as a the preferred site, UC Davis has continued to review other potential sites and no candidate sites have been available for purchase.

5.4.1 Alternative Access Route Options

Under this rejected alternative, all of the proposed site improvements at the Crystal Lake property would continue as described in the proposed project. The alternative feature of this effort was to consider all feasible options for site access to avoid using Crystal Lake Road near the Snowflower Inc., Raccoon campsites. Figure 5-1 illustrates the approximate location (in shaded green) of the Snowflower Inc., Raccoon campsites which are within 20 feet of the existing road. If feasible, utilizing a route that avoids impact to the Snowflower Inc., Raccoon campsites would eliminate many of the potential environmental effects of the project. The University developed route options, surveyed the routes, estimated construction costs of the routes, discussed routes with affected landowners and was unable to bring forward a feasible alternative access route for the proposed project. The following discussion summarizes the routes that were considered, the technical details of each route, and the feasibility of using each route.

Option 2. Option 2 is shown as a pink line north of the existing Snowflower Inc., Raccoon campsites. This options would require extensive grading and would require the approval of either the Snowflower Inc., Raccoon ownership and/or the approval of a third-party landowner (ELS-Thousand Trails, Inc.). After reviewing the option with Snowflower Inc., Raccoon representatives the University was told that approval of the route would not be provided. This alternative was rejected as infeasible because legal access to the route is not available.
Option 3: Option 3 is shown as a blue line on the Figure 5-1. This option would cross west of Crystal Lake on an open granite area and then extend southward from the project property line on to US Forest Service land. The option would cross on or near a significant petroglyph site and would cross near a wetland area off of the project property. A surveying effort and cost estimating was conducted and a site visit with representative from the US Forest Service took place in 2014. The US Forest Service representatives explained that forest service approval for such a route would not be supported if other legally accessible means were already available. In addition, the US Forest Service process could require US Congressional approval to receive permission for road access through federal land to a private parcel. Given that the project currently has a legally available access route (Crystal Lake Road), the high construction costs, and the indication that federal approval would not be forthcoming, this alternative was rejected as infeasible.

Option 4: Option 4 is shown as a green line on Figure 5-1 and matches the existing eastward segment of Crystal Lake Road across the railroad tracks and continuing on to the Interstate 80 Eagle Lakes freeway interchange. Option 2 would require permission from the railroad to cross the tracks. The eastward segment of Crystal Lake Road across the tracks is currently available for emergency use only. Developing the route for regular use would require railroad approval. The University explored crossing options with the Union Pacific Railroad and included paid for a railroad consultant to evaluate crossing needs at the proposed location. The railroad has indicated that no approval would be forthcoming for an at-grade crossing of the tracks. The railroad would require construction of a bridge or tunnel if access is desired. The University evaluated the options of constructing a bridge or a tunnel. These options would be very expensive with rough estimate indicating that such a crossing would exceed $10 million in construction costs. The high cost of this option makes it financially infeasible for further consideration.

Option 5: Would utilize an existing dirt/gravel road with only minor construction improvements needed. The route would require permission from Snowflower Inc., Raccoon. In discussions with Snowflower Inc., Raccoon, the representatives have indicated that no approval for using Option 5 would be considered. This alternative was rejected as infeasible because legal access to the route is not available.

5.5 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED IN DETAIL

This section presents an evaluation of three alternatives to the proposed project: Alternative 1: Event Center Only; Alternative 2: Smaller Alumni Camp; and No Project Alternative. For each alternative, a brief description is first presented, followed by a summary impact analysis relative to the proposed project, and an assessment of the degree to which the alternative would meet project objectives.
5.5.1 Alternative 1: Event Center Only

Description

Under Alternative 1, the Alumni Camp would not be constructed and the existing lodge would undergo interior renovations to function as an event center for small conferences, wedding, and other private events. Exterior improvements would include replacement of the existing children’s play structure with a gazebo and a deck or paved area approximately 40 feet by 40 feet. Events could take place during spring, summer, or fall. Attendance would be limited to 50 people. None of the facilities for the Alumni Camp (pool, lake beach development, maintenance facilities, roads or infrastructure) would be constructed. Recreational fishing would not be a featured activity and fish stocking would not occur. The total acreage of disturbance associated with this alternative would be approximately 4 acres.

Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

Project impacts related to light and glare from new facilities would be reduced under this alternative as compared to the proposed project and the potential impacts would be less than significant rather than significant.

Agricultural and Forestry

Under this alternative, the proposed uses could take place on land that does not meet the state definition of timberland. This would avoid impacts related to timberland removal. The potential impacts would be less than significant rather than significant.

Air Quality

Air quality impacts from construction and operation of the Event Center Only would be reduced under this alternative because the reduced amount of new facilities and the reduced population would have less emissions. The impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project.

Aquatic Resources

Under this alternative, the proposed project would result in substantially less ground disturbance, vegetation clearing, and construction of impervious surfaces, than would occur under the proposed project. Although the potential for erosion, sedimentation, and contaminant impacts would still occur, the smaller area and volume of soil disturbance would mean that the potential for and magnitude of these
impacts would be less than under the proposed project. Furthermore, the same construction-related BMPs and mitigation measures proposed under the proposed project would be implemented under this alternative to protect water quality during construction. A smaller septic system would be needed under this alternative, thereby lowering the potential for eutrophication of downstream waterways. Fishing pressure would be similar to existing conditions (i.e., less than that which would occur under the proposed project) and potential impacts associated with fish stocking would be avoided.

Terrestrial Biological Resources

The proposed Event Center Only Alternative would have impacts similar to the proposed project due to vegetation clearing in the areas adjacent to the event center and roads, but at a much reduced scale. Because the alternative would not include a new dock and beach area, no wetlands would be directly affected. This alternative could have the same potentially significant impact on riparian habitat due to vegetation clearing around the event center and along the access road. Mitigation for impacts on riparian habitat would be the same as for the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Cultural resources impacts would be similar under this alternative as compared to the proposed projects because increased visitation could result in the same visitor and construction related impacts. Impacts to cultural resources from proposed development within Crystal Lake would be avoided under this alternative.

Geology and Soils

The proposed project and the Event Center Only Alternative would have similar impacts due to development of approximately 4 acres of project improvements. However, Impact GEO-6 would not apply under the Event Center Only Alternative. All seismic and soils issues would still apply under this alternative, albeit at a much smaller scale. Because the Event Center Only Alternative would involve a smaller population and less development, the potential impacts of the alternative would be less than those of the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Greenhouse Gas impacts from construction and operation of the Event Center Only would be less than the proposed project under this alternative because the reduced amount of new facilities and the reduced population would produce fewer emissions. The impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazards and hazardous materials impacts from construction and operation of the Event Center Only would be less than the proposed project under this alternative because the reduced amount of new facilities that would need diesel fuel for construction and the reduced population would need reduced fuel for building heating. The impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project. The Event Center Only alternative would minimize impacts related to use of the emergency access route on Crystal Lake Road.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The proposed project and the Event Center Only Alternative would have the same less-than-significant impact as Impact WQ-1 due to development of approximately 4 acres of project improvements. A SWPPP and other water quality requirements would apply, thus decreasing this impact to a less-than-significant level. The level of significance for Impacts WQ-4 and WW-5 would still apply because a slight alteration of drainage characteristics would occur, requiring similar mitigation to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels. The remainder of the water quality impacts identified for the proposed project would not apply due to small footprint of the Event Center Only Alternative; the lack of need for a larger septic system and/or alternative wastewater disposal; and because there would be no lake beach development. Because the Event Center Only Alternative would involve a smaller population and less development, the potential impacts of the alternative would be less than those of the proposed project.

Land Use and Planning

The Event Center Only would result in similar impacts to the proposed project in terms of impacts to the Snowflower Inc. Raccoon camp areas. Increased vehicle trips may not be compatible with the close proximity of the campsites to the road edge. Although reduced by this alternative, the impact would remain.

Mineral Resources

Mineral resources impacts would be the same under the Event Center Only alternative as the proposed project.
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**Noise**

Under the Event Center Only Alternative, the alumni camp would not be constructed. The event center would generate similar operational noise under this alternative as it would with the proposed project. According to the modeling results, 50 people shouting at the event center would generate noise levels of about 25 dBA at the edge of the Snowflower Campground. When combined with the ambient noise level of 36 dBA $L_{eq}$, 50 people shouting at the event center could increase noise levels by less than 1 decibel. Operational noise impacts associated with the Event Center Only Alternative would be less than significant with this alternative.

There would be interior renovations implemented at the event center, but this would not generate substantial construction noise. The construction of a gazebo and a deck or paved area to the event center premises would generate noise, but would generate substantially less noise than the construction associated with the proposed project. Depending upon the tools used, it is likely that construction would not even be audible to the nearby noise-sensitive land uses. Therefore, construction impacts would be less than significant under this alternative.

Additionally, and as with the proposed project, there would be no impacts related to construction vibration or public or private airports with implementation of this alternative.

**Population and Housing**

As with the proposed project, the Event Center Only would result in a less than significant impact to population and housing. The proposed project impact is very minor and the Event Center Only impact would be less than the impact of the proposed project.

**Public Services and Recreation**

As with the proposed project, the Event Center Only would result in a less than significant impact to public services and recreation. The proposed project impact is very minor and the Event Center Only impact would be less than the impact of the proposed project.

**Transportation and Traffic**

The proposed project would result in less than significant transportation and traffic impacts and the Event Center Only alternative would produce lower traffic volumes that the proposed project. Accordingly, the traffic impacts from the Event Center Only would be less than the impacts from the proposed project and would be less than significant.
Utilities and Service Systems

The proposed project would result in less than significant utilities and service system impacts and the Event Center Only alternative would produce less impacts because the utility demands would be less than the proposed project. Accordingly, the utility impacts from the Event Center Only would be less than the impacts from the proposed project and would be less than significant.

Ability to Accomplish Project Objectives

The Event Center Only Alternative would not meet the project objectives of establishing an alumni camp and environmental education center. The Event Center Only could achieve limited success in fostering increased engagement of alumni in university-related activities because the events at the event center could include education and social events that could be related to university programs. However, the lack of an alumni camp would not result in opportunities for families to participate in extended recreational opportunities and the Event Center Only alternative would serve a very small portion of the desired population.

5.5.2 Alternative 2: Smaller Alumni Camp

Description

Under Alternative 2, the Alumni Camp would be scaled back to 50 percent of the planned size; the total acreage of disturbance associated with this alternative would be approximately 10 acres. The proposed dining commons building would be constructed near the existing caretaker house. No pool would be constructed and no beach would be proposed along the lake shore. The existing dock and grass area would serve as the lake recreation access point for camp attendees. Sleeping cabins would be installed north and east of the caretaker house. No camp development would take place east of the existing tennis court.

Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

Project impacts related to light and glare from new facilities would be reduced under the Smaller Alumni Camp alternative as compared to the proposed project and the potential impacts would be less than significant rather than significant.
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Agricultural and Forestry

The Smaller Alumni Camp alternative would result in reduced forestry impacts in comparison to the proposed project. The design of a Smaller Alumni Camp could produce a smaller footprint which may reduce the amount of impact to timberland. This would lessen the impact but would still result in a loss to timberland.

Air Quality

Air quality impacts from construction and operation of the Smaller Alumni Camp would be reduced under this alternative because the reduced amount of new facilities and the reduced population would have less emissions. The impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project.

Aquatic Resources

Fishing pressure would be expected to be about one-half as that expected under the proposed project. Although the number of fish that would be stocked would be about one-half as the number under the proposed project, potential impacts associated with fish stocking would be expected to be the same.

Under this alternative, impacts would be similar to those described under the proposed project, except that the potential magnitude of those impacts would be expected to be less than under the proposed project. Proposed mitigation, where applicable, would reduce significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Terrestrial Biological Resources

The proposed Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative would have impacts similar to the proposed project due to vegetation clearing in the areas adjacent to the event center and roads, but at a reduced scale. Because the alternative would not include a new dock and beach area, no wetlands would be directly affected. This alternative could have the same potentially significant impact on riparian habitat due to vegetation clearing around the event center and along the access road. Mitigation for impacts on riparian habitat would be the same as for the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Cultural resources impacts would be similar under this alternative as compared to the proposed projects because increased visitation could result in the same visitor and construction related impacts. Impacts to cultural resources from proposed development within Crystal Lake would be avoided under this alternative.
Geology and Soils

The proposed project and the Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative would have similar impacts for those described under proposed project. The level of significance for all identified geology, soils, and seismicity impacts and associated mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would still apply to the Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative. Because the Smaller Alumni Camp would involve a smaller population and less development, the potential impacts of the alternative would be less than those of the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Greenhouse Gas impacts from construction and operation of the Smaller Alumni Camp would be less than the proposed project under this alternative because the reduced amount of new facilities and the reduced population would produce fewer emissions. The impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazards and hazardous materials impacts from construction and operation of the Smaller Alumni Camp would be less than the proposed project under this alternative because the reduced amount of new facilities that would need diesel fuel for construction and the reduced population would need reduced fuel for building heating. The impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project. The Event Center Only alternative would minimize impacts related to use of the emergency access route on Crystal Lake Road because the population would be lower than the proposed project population.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The proposed project and the Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative would have similar impacts for those described under proposed project. The level of significance for all identified water quality impacts and associated mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would still apply to the Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative, with the exception of Impact WQ-8 because there would be no lake beach development. Because the Smaller Alumni Camp would involve a smaller population and less development, the potential impacts of the alternative would be less than those of the proposed project.
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Land Use and Planning

The Smaller Alumni Camp would result in similar impacts to the proposed project in terms of impacts to the Snowflower Inc. Raccoon camp areas. Increased vehicle trips may not be compatible with the close proximity of the campsites to the road edge. Although reduced by this alternative, the impact would remain significant. The reduced size of this alternative may reduce the feasibility of Mitigation LU-1 (purchase of Raccoon camp) resulting in no feasible mitigation to reduce the land use conflict identified in Impact LU-1. This impact would then remain Significant and Unavoidable instead of being mitigated to a less-than-significant level as identified under the proposed project.

Mineral Resources

Mineral resources impacts would be the same under the Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative alternative as the proposed project.

Noise

With the Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative, the development would be scaled back to 50% of the size of the proposed project. While the pool and beach would not be constructed, the existing dock and grass area (which are closer to the Snowflower Campground than the project beach site would be) would be utilized by campers accessing the lake; noise levels at this lake access point would be similar to those generated at the project beach, even with half of the amount of individuals present. Additionally, the amphitheater would still be built and would still have the potential to generate excessive noise. Halving the noise source (reducing the number of people by 50 percent) would reduce the modeled Project amphitheater noise level of 36 dBA by approximately 3 dB; however, a noise level of 33 dB would still add logarithmically to the ambient 36 dB to total a noise level of 38 dBA L_{eq}. Operation noise impacts would be reduced under this alternative as compared to the proposed project, but impacts would remain significant because the increase in noise would likely still be perceptible at the Snowflower Campground.

Although construction of this alternative may take place over a shorter overall period of time, it would involve the use of the same equipment that would be required for the proposed project. Therefore construction noise impacts related to a temporary increase in noise would remain significant with this alternative.

Additionally, and as with the proposed project, there would be no impacts related to construction vibration or public or private airports with implementation of this alternative.
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Population and Housing

As with the proposed project, the Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative would result in a less than significant impact to population and housing. The proposed project impact is very minor and the Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative impact would be less than the impact of the proposed project.

Public Services and Recreation

As with the proposed project, the Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative would result in a less than significant impact to public services and recreation. The proposed project impact is very minor and the Event Center Only impact would be less than the impact of the proposed project.

Transportation and Traffic

The proposed project would result in less than significant transportation and traffic impacts and the Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative would produce lower traffic volumes that the proposed project because the camp population would be lower than the population of the proposed project. Accordingly, the traffic impacts from the Event Center Only would be less than the impacts from the proposed project and would be less than significant.

Utilities and Service Systems

The proposed project would result in less than significant utilities and service system impacts and the Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative would produce less impacts because the utility demands would be less than the proposed project. Accordingly, the utility impacts from the Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative would be less than the impacts from the proposed project and would be less than significant.

Ability to Accomplish Project Objectives

The Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative would not meet the full objective of creating an alumni camp and environmental education center. The reduced facilities and reduced capacity for visitors would restrict the scheduling flexibility that is needed to accommodate large groups. In addition, the reduced camp revenues would reduce the ability of the project to adequately pay for the proposed Mitigation LU-1 which could reduce the Significant and Unavoidable impact of Impact LU-1 to a less than significant level.
5.5.4 Alternative 4: No Project Alternative

**Description**

*State CEQA Guidelines* require a consideration of the No Project Alternative. Under the No Project alternative, UC Davis would not develop the Crystal Lake property. No construction would take place under the No Project Alternative. No ground disturbance expected. The property would continue under the current management with existing activities (occasional use of the existing lake house) expected to stay the same.

**Impact Analysis**

For all resource topics and all impacts, the No Project Alternative would result in reduced impacts with nearly all impacts eliminated. The No Project Alternative represents the continuation of the existing baseline conditions which are represented by low levels of visitation, no new facility construction, and minor amounts of property maintenance. While the cultural resources impacts associate with new visitors would be avoided under this alternative, the significant resources would not be further evaluated and a management plan for the protection of the resources would not be implemented. Therefore, potential impacts to cultural resources could occur under this alternative. However, given that the current land management has adequately preserved the resources, this impact is identified as less than significant.

**Ability to Accomplish Project Objectives**

The No Project Alternative would not meet the project objectives of developing an alumni camp and environmental education center.

5.6 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative—that is, the alternative having the potential for the fewest significant environmental impacts—from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. *Table 5.0-1* provides a summary comparison of the alternatives with the proposed project with the purpose of highlighting whether the alternative would result in a similar, greater, or lesser impact, than the proposed project.

If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126(d)(2) requires that the EIR shall identify another alternative as environmentally superior. Of the remaining alternatives, Alternative 1, Event Center Only is considered the environmentally superior alternative because this alternative would result in similar or lower impacts as the proposed project with respect to all resource areas. However, this alternative would not establish an alumni camp and would
not meet basic project objectives. The Smaller Alumni Camp Alternative could also hinder ability to provide a full-service camp by reducing the potential revenue that would pay for site amenities. The Smaller Alumni Camp alternative may not provide sufficient revenue to support the implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-1.
Table 5.0-1
Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Topic</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Alternative 1 Event Center Only</th>
<th>Alternative 2 Smaller Alumni Camp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>S/LTS</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>S/SU</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>S/LTS</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Resources</td>
<td>S/LTS</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Biological Resources</td>
<td>S/LTS</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>S/SU</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology &amp; Soils</td>
<td>S/LTS</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>S/LTS</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>S/LTS</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>S/SU</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>S/SU</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Comparable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

- **S** Significant impact
- **PS** Potentially significant impact
- **LTS** Less than significant impact
- **S/LTS** Significant/Less than significant with mitigation
- **S/SU** Significant/Significant and Unavoidable
- **NI** No Impact
- **=** Impact similar to proposed project
- **--** Impact less than proposed project
- **+** Impact greater than proposed project
6.0 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15126 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must include a discussion of the following three topics:

- Significant environmental effects which cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented;
- Significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved in the proposed project should it be implemented; and
- Growth inducing effects of the proposed project.

6.2 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS

An EIR must identify significant impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project that could not be mitigated to a less than significant level. As part of the certification process, The Board of Regents of the University of California (The Regents) will make a final decision as to the significance of impacts and the feasibility of mitigation measures in this EIR. As detailed in Section 4.0, implementation of the proposed project would result in the following significant impacts that may not be mitigated to a less than significant level:

6.2.2 Land Use

Impact LU-1: Physically divide an established community (Significant; Significant and Unavoidable)

Impact LU-3: Conflict with existing and future adjacent land uses (Significant; Significant and Unavoidable)

6.2.1 Noise

Impact NOI-1: Construction of the proposed project would expose existing off-site and on-site receptors to elevated noise levels. (Potentially Significant; Significant and Unavoidable)

The EIR provides a detailed analysis of these impacts in Section 4.13 (Land Use) and 4.15 (Noise). A proposed purchase of the impacted property could reduce the identified impact to less than significant.
The feasibility of this mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure LU-1) is unknown because the landowner may decide to not sell the property in which case the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Air Quality and Cultural Resources were also identified in the EIR to contribute to cumulative impacts that could be significant and unavoidable.

6.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Section 15126.2(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR must include a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by a proposed project. Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if:

- the primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
- the proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves the wasteful use of energy);
- the project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources; or
- the project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project.

The proposed project is not expected to result in significant irreversible environmental changes. The impacts identified as significant and unavoidable (Land Use and Noise) could be reversed through implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-1. The proposed land use development would be a long-term land use that would be expected to continue for many years. However, the type of structures and utilities could be eventually removed and the site restored upon completion of the proposed use.

Resources that would be permanently and continually consumed by project implementation include water, electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels. In addition, construction activities related to the proposed project would result in the irretrievable commitment of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels (including fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for automobiles and construction equipment.

The State CEQA Guidelines also require a discussion of the potential for irreversible environmental damage caused by an accident associated with the project. While the project would use, transport, store, and dispose of hazardous wastes, as described in Section 4.11, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the university complies with all applicable state and federal laws and existing campus programs, practices,
and procedures related to hazardous materials, which reduces the likelihood and severity of accidents that could result in irreversible environmental damage.

### 6.4 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

This section evaluates the potential for the proposed project to induce growth in the Sacramento area. Section 15126.2(d) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR include a discussion of the potential for a proposed project to foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.

The *State CEQA Guidelines* do not provide specific criteria for evaluating growth inducement and state that it must not be assumed that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment. Growth inducement is generally not quantified, but is instead evaluated as either occurring or not occurring with implementation of a project. The identification of growth-inducing impacts is generally informational, and mitigation of growth inducement is not required under CEQA. It must be emphasized that the *State CEQA Guidelines* require an EIR to “discuss the ways” that a project could be growth inducing and to, “discuss the characteristics of some projects that may encourage ... activities that could significantly affect the environment.” However, the *State CEQA Guidelines* do not require an EIR to predict or speculate specifically where such growth would occur, in what form it would occur, or when it would occur.

For the purposes of this analysis, the proposed project would be considered growth-inducing if it meets either of the following criteria:

- Implementation of the proposed project causes economic expansion and population growth through employment expansion and/or the construction of new housing, or
- Implementation of the propose project removes an obstacle to population growth (for example, through the expansion of public services or utilities into an area that does not presently receive these services), or through the provision of new access to an area, or a change in a restrictive zoning or General Plan land use designation.

An evaluation of the proposed project against these criteria is provided below.

#### 6.4.1 Employment and Population Growth

Potential growth inducing impacts of the proposed project are evaluated in Section 4.0 with regard to population, housing, and public services. The proposed project would operate a vacation camp with predominantly seasonal employees and approximately 3-5 permanent employees. The proposed project would procur goods and services from the Sacramento region, foothill region, and Truckee area. The
additional spending in these areas to support the proposed project is not expected to generate additional employment or population growth. Within the regional context, the spending created during the peak 10 week season of the proposed vacation camp and event center would be minimal and would not generate new employment or population growth. The proposed project would not be considered growth-inducing with respect to employment and population growth.

6.4.4 Removal of an Impediment to Growth

Growth in an area may result from the removal of physical impediments or restrictions to growth, as well as the removal of planning impediments resulting from land use plans and policies. In this context, physical growth impediments may include non-existent or inadequate access to an area or the lack of essential public services (e.g., water services), and planning impediments may include restrictive zoning and/or general plan designations. The proposed project would be served primarily from on-site utilities and would not provide utilities to off-site properties. The project would not disrupt the planning context or process of Nevada County, the primary land use authority for non-federal lands in Nevada County. Based on these basic factors, the project is not expected to remove an impediment to growth.

6.4.5 Conclusion

As discussed above, the proposed project would not remove impediments to growth and/or result in indirect/direct population and/or employment growth. Therefore, implementing the project would not be considered growth inducing.
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