

5 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The 2025 General Plan was described and analyzed in the previous sections with an emphasis on potentially significant impacts and recommended mitigation measures to avoid those impacts to the extent feasible. The State CEQA Guidelines also require the description and comparative analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that could feasibly attain the objectives of the project.

The following discussion is intended to inform the public and decision-makers of project alternatives that have been developed and the positive and negative aspects of those alternatives. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and procedures, four project alternatives are discussed below. The first alternative discussed is the CEQA-required “No Project” Alternative, which assumes that the Existing 1996 General Plan would remain in place. CEQA Guidelines also require that the environmentally-superior alternative be identified.¹ This information is included at the end of this chapter.

Each of the three project alternatives would be somewhat similar to the proposed project and to each other in terms of the specific areas where alternative land use designations would be applied. A total of eleven “change areas” are considered in each of the alternatives; each alternative considers a variety of future residential, commercial, industrial, public and open space uses for these various sites, which in most, but not all cases are different from one alternative to another, and between the alternatives and the proposed project. In each of the three project alternatives, all parts of the Town outside of the change areas are assumed to have the proposed 2025 General Plan land use designations applied, and that all goals, policies and actions of the 2025 General Plan would be in place.

The four alternatives presented and analyzed in this chapter are:

- ◆ **The Existing General Plan Alternative.** The proposed 2025 General Plan would not be adopted and the existing 1996 General Plan for the Town of Truckee would remain in effect.

¹ CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e)(2).

- ◆ **Mixed-Use and Outlying Open Space Alternative.** Change areas in central parts of Truckee would be designated for mixed commercial and residential land uses, with more land preserved as open space in outlying areas.
- ◆ **Economic Diversification Alternative.** A larger number of the change areas would be designated for job-generating commercial and industrial uses in Truckee, in order to increase employment opportunities.
- ◆ **Increased Residential Development Alternative.** Additional housing opportunities would be provided by designating more of the change areas for residential uses, and at higher densities.

Table 5-1 summarizes the key features of each alternative, while Table 5-2 summarizes the result of analyzing each alternative against the impact factors considered for the 2025 General Plan, according to whether it would have a mitigating or adverse effect. This analysis is presented in greater detail in the following sections.

A. Existing General Plan Alternative

This section analyzes the Existing General Plan Alternative against the 2025 General Plan.

1. Principal Characteristics

Under this alternative, the proposed General Plan would not be adopted and the existing General Plan would remain in effect. Thus, new development would occur according to the existing General Plan land use designations, and the existing policy guidance for the Town.

Overall, the distribution of land uses in Truckee would not be substantially different under the Existing General Plan Alternative than under the 2025 General Plan. As shown in Table 5-1, the number of residential units is projected to be slightly less, and the amount of non-residential growth is assumed

TABLE 5-1 | **ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY**

#	Change Area Site	2025 GENERAL PLAN			EXISTING 19% GENERAL PLAN			MIXED-USE ALTERNATIVE			ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION ALTERNATIVE			INCREASED HOUSING ALTERNATIVE		
		Land Use Designation	Approximate Dwelling Units ¹	Non-Residential Square Feet ²	Land Use Designation	Approximate Dwelling Units ¹	Non-Residential Square Feet ²	Land Use Designation	Approximate Dwelling Units ¹	Non-Residential Square Feet ²	Land Use Designation	Approximate Dwelling Units ¹	Non-Residential Square Feet ²	Land Use Designation	Approximate Dwelling Units ¹	Non-Residential Square Feet ²
1a.	PC1 and Adjacent Commercial Area	PC	0	70,000	COM/PC	50	150,000	Mixed COM/RH	70	95,000	COM (lodging)	0	225,000	RES 1-2	35	0
1b.	PC1	PC	300	0	PC	50	150,000	Mixed COM/RES 6	150	300,000	IND/COM	0	450,000	RES 6; COM; OSR	240	60,000
2.	Former Middle School	PUB	0	80,000	PUB	0	0	COM and; Half RES 3-4	60	200,000	PUB (0	0	RH	300	0
3.	McIver Hill	SSA	50	65,000	SSA	50	87,000	PUB (College Campus)	50	0	SSA	50	87,000	OSR	10	0
4.	Upper McIver Dairy	COM	0	0	RC/OS	0	0	RH	85	0	PUB (H/O)	0	60,000	OSR	0	0
5.	Ponderosa Golf Course	SSA	150	0	OSR	5	0	OSR	5	0	COM	0	90,000	RES 3-4; OSR	40	0
6.	Pioneer Commerce Center Area	IND	0	585,000	RES 0.5	60	0	IND; RH; RC/OS	240	175,000	IND/Live-Work; RES 3; OSR	210	130,000	RES 1-2; IND	160	350,000
7.	PC2 Alder Drive	RH	150	0	PC	0	0	PUB (Park)	0	0	RES 3-4	40	0	OSR	0	0
8.	I-80/SR 267/SR 89 North Triangle	PUB	0	0	PC	0	0	PUB (Community/Recreation Center)	0	0	COM	0	110,000	OSR	0	0
9a.	Joeger Drive Area: TTSA/TSD Lands	PUB	0	0	PUB	0	0	PUB	0	0	PUB; COM/RES 3-4	40	90,000	PUB	0	0
9b.	Joeger Drive Area: Teichert Mine	PUB	0	0	RC/OS	5	0	RC/OS	0	0	IND	0	350,000	RC/OS	0	0
9c.	Joeger Drive Area: Corporation Yard	PUB	0	0	PUB	0	0	PUB	0	0	IND	0	200,000	RES 1-2	50	0
10.	Hirschdale Mine	RES 0.5/RC/OS	90	0	RES 0.5	90	0	OSR	65	0	RES 0.5	90	0	RES 1-2	370	0
11.	Airport Flat	RC/OS	10	0	RC/OS	10	0	OSR	40	0	OSR; COM	65	130,000	RC-10	65	0
	Subtotal		750	800,000		320	387,000		765	770,000		495	1,922,000		1,270	410,000
	All Other New		8,345	600,000		6,850	2,280,000		8,345	600,000		8,345	600,000		6,850	600,000
	Existing		11,000	2,800,000		11,000	2,800,000		11,000	2,800,000		11,000	2,800,000		10,903	2,800,000
	Total		18,950	4,200,000		18,170	5,467,000		18,615	4,170,000		18,345	5,322,000		19,023	3,810,000

1. Primary Units Only 2. Reflects commercial and industrial square footage only.

TOWN OF TRUCKEE
2025 GENERAL PLAN EIR
 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

TABLE 5-2 **COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

Topic	Existing General Plan (No Project)	Mixed-Use Development Alternative	Economic Diversification Alternative	Increased Residential Development Alternative
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	-	--	--	=
Air Quality	-	=	--	+
Biological Resources	-	-	-	=
Cultural Resources	=	=	=	=
Geology, Soils and Seismicity	=	=	=	=
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	=	+	+	-
Hydrology and Flooding	=	=	-	=
Land Use	-	=	=	=
Noise	-	=	-	+
Population and Housing	-	=	=	=
Public Services	+	=	+	-
Traffic and Circulation	-	-	--	+
Utilities and Infrastructure	=	=	=	=

- + Insubstantial improvement compared to the proposed project
- = Same impact as proposed project
- Insubstantial deterioration compared to the proposed project
- Substantial deterioration compared to the proposed project

to be slightly greater under the No Project Alternative as the proposed General Plan. Under the Existing General Plan Alternative, the Ponderosa Golf Course site would remain designated for open space uses. The area designated as PC-2 would remain as it is presently defined, and would continue to include the Alder Creek Middle School site and the area to its east, and the SR 267/I-80/SR 89 North Triangle. The northern part of the Hirschdale Mine site would be designated for low-density housing, rather than open space. Land under the ownership of the US Forest Service at the northern edge of the Town and near the Glenshire Bridge designation would continue to be designated as Resource Conservation/Open Space, rather than Public, and those near I-80/SR 267 would continue to be designated as Public, rather than Open Space Recreation. The amount of land designated for industrial uses around the Pioneer Commerce center would not be expanded.

2. Impact Analysis

a. Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Both the Existing General Plan Alternative and the proposed Plan would result in new development that would change the existing appearance of some parts of the town, including development in some highly visible sites, such as PC-1, the Railyard, McIver Hill, and the area around the SR 89 North/SR 267/I-80 interchange. In both cases, these changes could result in significant impacts to visual quality, particularly in the case of sites that are currently undeveloped open space areas that remain in a largely natural state. The Existing General Plan and the proposed Plan both include a number of policies that seek to minimize the visual impacts of new development in the town through clustering, buffering and screening of development from scenic corridors; regulation of hillside and ridgeline development; signage, and other strategies. The proposed Plan amplifies and refines many of these policies, and includes a number of new goals, policies and actions that would preserve visual resources throughout the town as a whole and improve the visual quality of certain key areas of the town such as the Gateway area, the Truckee Riverfront, and the Brockway Road Corridor. Open space areas are among the primary contributors to the Town's scenic and visual resources, and the

proposed Plan presents more aggressive strategies for permanently protecting Truckee’s open space areas than are found in the existing General Plan, and designates more of these lands (for example, the National Forest lands in the north part of Truckee) for uses that would be less likely to create visual impact. Overall, the existing General Plan would be slightly worse than the 2025 General Plan with regard to impacts to visual quality.

b. Air Quality

The existing General Plan would result in less residential development, but somewhat more non-residential development than the proposed Plan. Overall vehicle trips would be less under the proposed project than the existing General Plan, which would result in fewer vehicle emissions and road dust. Both the existing and proposed Plan would have a similar distribution of land uses across the town as a whole, and so neither would expose substantially different numbers of people to localized air pollutants such as diesel emissions from train and truck traffic. Overall, due to the slightly reduced number of vehicle trips, the impacts to air quality would be insubstantially worse under the existing General Plan compared to the proposed Plan.

c. Biological Resources

As noted elsewhere, the distribution of development under the proposed General Plan and the existing General Plan are relatively similar. Both the proposed Plan and the Existing General Plan include a number of goals, policies and actions that would avoid potentially significant impacts to biological resources.

Although the proposed Plan would allow for the development of some sites (e.g. Upper McIver Dairy and Ponderosa Golf Course) that are currently designated for open space uses in the Existing General Plan, these sites are relatively small, and, in the case of Ponderosa Golf Course, have compromised habitat value due to modification of natural vegetation. However, the proposed Plan’s goals and policies go further than the existing General Plan in supporting the long-term preservation and management of open space areas, including those that contain important biological resources. The proposed

Plan also clarifies and amplifies policies concerning aspects such as preservation of native species and sensitive habitats, protecting wildlife corridors, and establishing criteria and standards for completing biological resource assessments and evaluating potential impacts to biological resources more than does the existing General Plan. Therefore the existing General Plan is considered to be insubstantially worse than the proposed Plan.

d. Cultural Resources

The policy guidance contained in the existing General Plan provides similar protections regarding historic and cultural resources to the proposed General Plan. In both cases, these policies would serve to protect known, and hitherto unknown cultural resources that might be affected by new development. For this reason, the existing General Plan would be considered equivalent to the proposed General Plan with regard to cultural resources.

e. Geology, Soils and Seismicity

The existing General Plan proposes development that is distributed in a similar manner to the proposed General Plan. Current State and federal regulations require specific mitigations to avoid impacts related to geologic and seismic hazards, which would apply to both the existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan. For this reason, the existing General Plan is considered to be equivalent to the proposed General Plan.

f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The existing General Plan proposes development that is distributed in a similar manner to the proposed General Plan, and neither would place a substantially greater number of people or structures in proximity to natural or man-made hazards (e.g., in wildland fire area, and the Truckee-Tahoe Airport) than the other. However, the proposed Plan does allow for some residential development on the Ponderosa Golf Course, which is in proximity to the Truckee-Tahoe Airport, and could expose more people to aircraft-related hazards.

The existing General Plan would result in somewhat more non-residential development that could increase the use, storage and transport of hazardous materials relative to the proposed Plan. Conversely, this alternative would allow for a slightly lower level of housing and population growth, creating correspondingly less household hazardous waste.

Both the existing and proposed General Plan include goals and policies that would minimize the threat to life and property from hazards; in addition, hazardous materials generation, storage and clean-up are heavily regulated by federal, State and local regulations that would reduce the potential for hazards and hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level. New development under either the Existing General Plan or the proposed Plan would be subject to the land use compatibility planning guidelines established in the Tahoe-Truckee Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. As a result, the existing General Plan would be about the same as the proposed General Plan with regard to hazardous materials and other hazards.

g. Hydrology

The existing General Plan proposes development in areas that are within the 100-year floodplain of the Truckee River and other waterways in a similar manner to the proposed General Plan. There is slightly less residential and slightly more non-residential development projected in the No Project Alternative; on balance, the existing General Plan would be considered the same as the proposed Plan with regard to hydrology and flooding.

h. Land Use

Under existing General Plan Alternative, the broad distribution of land uses would be relatively similar to that which would occur under the proposed project. Neither the proposed General Plan nor the existing General Plan would physically divide existing communities. However, under the existing General Plan, the Town would have somewhat less of an ability to direct specific development changes to ensure that new development is well-connected and compatible with surrounding uses. The proposed General Plan includes a refinement of land use designations, redesignation of certain areas to better

correspond with the prevailing use and/or ownership of those parcels, increased policy direction for the Town overall, as well as more specific policies for land use in the Special Study Areas and Overlay Areas. Taking into consideration the relative benefits of the proposed General Plan, including more specific land use guidance for key development areas, the No Project Alternative would be slightly worse than the proposed General Plan with regard to land use.

i. Noise

The 2025 General Plan would generate less traffic, and thus there would be less traffic-generated noise than under the existing General Plan, which would be an improvement. Although there would be two significant impacts under the 2025 General Plan with regard to groundbourne vibration and construction noise, these impacts would also occur under the Existing General Plan. The No Project Alternative would therefore be insubstantially worse than the 2005 General Plan.

j. Population, Employment, and Housing

As mentioned above, the existing General Plan Alternative's amount of residential would be somewhat less, and non-residential development would be slightly more than would occur under the proposed Plan. Neither the proposed General Plan nor the No Project Alternative would result in displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing or people. Due to the smaller amount of commercial and industrial development, the proposed Plan would potentially allow for fewer new jobs to be created in Truckee; however, the proposed Plan includes a new Economic Development Element that through its goals and policies would help the Town to attract and retain high quality jobs in Truckee. The proposed Plan would also provide additional opportunities for mixed-use and higher density housing, including requirements for new development to occur at minimum specified densities, thus potentially providing more opportunities for a range of housing types for all income levels. Thus, on balance, the proposed General Plan would be somewhat better than the Existing General Plan with regards to population, employment and housing.

k. Public Services

The smaller number of new residents associated with the lower level of residential development that could occur under the No Project Alternative would result in lower demands for essential community services such as police and fire protection, and schools and parks, and decrease the likelihood that new facilities, the construction of which might result in environmental impacts, would be needed to serve the additional increment of population. Although the increment of additional population, and resulting demand for services would be relatively small, the existing General Plan is considered to be slightly better than the proposed Plan with regard to community services.

l. Traffic and Circulation

Under the Existing General Plan Alternative, the level of roadway improvements and extensions required would be quite similar to that needed to serve the proposed General Plan. The No Project Alternative also includes a significantly expanded local roadway network, involving construction of new facilities, and other improvements such as road widening. Buildout of the existing General Plan would mean that Level of Service would be exceeded at 20 intersections (primarily along Donner Pass Road, along SR 267, and in the Downtown), and on seven roadway segments (including portions of SR 267, and SR 89 South, outside of the Town Limits). Similar exceedances would occur under the proposed Plan, with the exception of the section of SR 267 south of I-80, where LOS would not be exceeded under the proposed Plan.

Exceedance of these LOS standards would require signalization or other improvements, such as roadway widening. The existing General Plan would be subject to policy guidance under the existing General Plan, which includes actions in the Circulation Element to allow Level of Service D on all streets and intersections outside of the Downtown Study Area, and LOS E within the Downtown Study Area. The proposed Plan includes a policy that allows for LOS F in the Downtown on a short-term basis while study is made of the most appropriate combinations of traffic improvements to deal with projected volumes. The existing General Plan includes no such provision, al-

though similar impacts to Downtown traffic would occur under the General Plan. Further, the proposed Plan includes additional policies that would preclude the need for widening SR 267 in Truckee, which are not reflected in the 1996 General Plan

Regional traffic would still be a factor in Truckee under the existing General Plan, in conjunction with other development in the Tahoe area. Since the VMT and trip generation associated with the existing General Plan is very similar to that of the proposed Plan, it can be concluded that the impacts on regional roadways are similar.

In terms of traffic safety, emergency access, parking, transit planning and air traffic patterns, the existing General Plan is similar to the proposed General Plan; however, because it would not require widening of SR 267, and would accommodate projected exceedance of the normal Downtown LOS standard, the proposed Plan is superior to the existing General Plan in terms of traffic and circulation.

m. Utilities and Infrastructure

Under the existing General Plan, slightly less residential development, and slightly more non-residential growth is projected for the 20-year planning horizon as the proposed General Plan. Under either alternative, most of the increment of additional development would take place in and adjacent to existing development areas, in the more central parts of Truckee, and would not require significant expansion of infrastructure systems to serve it. Otherwise, the distribution of this growth would be relatively similar between the two alternatives. The existing General Plan would be subject to the policy guidance for infrastructure provision which includes goals, policies and actions to ensure that adequate water, wastewater and stormwater facilities are provided to meet the needs of future growth, in addition to policy guidance to encourage energy conservation. Specifically, the existing General Plan includes actions to coordinate with applicable Special Districts to ensure availability of needed infrastructure to service future development. Thus, as is the case with the proposed General Plan, no significant impact with regard to infrastruc-

ture provision would occur under the proposed Plan, and the two would be equivalent.

B. Mixed-Use and Outlying Open Space Alternative

This section analyzes the Mixed-Use and Outlying Open Space Alternative against the proposed 2025 General Plan.

1. Principal Characteristics

This alternative focuses on creating areas of mixed commercial and residential land uses in central Truckee locations, while preserving open space in outlying areas. A key feature of this alternative is the inclusion of several areas of mixed-use commercial and residential development. These areas, located mostly in more central parts of Truckee, have the potential to create new nodes of residential development in proximity to locations for commercial services and employment. It also designates more land for open space uses on larger sites in more outlying areas. This alternative also focuses, to the greatest extent among the three land use scenarios, on increasing the amount of housing that is affordable and available for rent and purchase by Truckee's year-round population.

Specific land use designations to achieve this scenario would include allocation of additional residential development within PC-1, on the site of the former middle school, and adjacent to the Pioneer Commerce Center. Both the Hirschdale Mine site and Airport Flat would be designated for Open Space Recreation, which would permit limited housing development along with low-intensity recreational uses. Ponderosa Golf Course would retain its existing OSR designation.

As shown in Table 5-1, this alternative would allow for about the same amount of residential and non-residential development as the proposed Plan.

2. Impact Analysis

The Mixed-Use and Outlying Open Space Alternative would have the following impacts relative to adoption of the proposed 2025 General Plan.

a. Aesthetics and Visual Resources

The alternative would have much the same impacts as the proposed Plan with regard to aesthetics. The exception would be in areas where the alternative would preserve certain sites in open space and/or recreation uses, including the Ponderosa Golf Course and Hirschdale Mine Site. In these cases, the open space qualities of these sites would be better preserved, and visual impacts might be reduced. However, the alternative would allow clustered residential uses on Airport Flat, an area of Truckee with a high level of scenic value, and visual prominence from I-80. This would potentially result in visual impacts from the alternative that would be substantially worse than the proposed Plan.

b. Air Quality

The alternative would allow for close to the same amount of residential and non-residential development as the proposed Plan. This would result in about the same amount of traffic as that generated by development allowed under the proposed Plan, with similar increases in emissions and re-entrained road dust. Therefore, the alternative would be neither better or worse than the proposed Plan with regard to air quality.

c. Biological Resources

As noted above, the alternative would not allow development in two areas on which development would be allowed in the proposed Plan, but would allow increased development at Airport Flat, a site with known wetland habitat and sensitive species. The Hirschdale Mine Site has already been extensively disturbed by mining activity, and so habitat values here might be more limited. In all cases, policies concerning biological resource preservation would be in place that would help to minimize impacts to these resources. Due to the increased potential for biological resource impacts at Airport Flat, on balance, the alternative would be insubstantially worse than the proposed Plan.

d. Cultural Resources

Both the Mixed-Use and Outlying Open Space Alternative and the proposed Plan would have in place similar protections regarding historic and cultural resources. However, there are two sites designated for development in the proposed project that would be left as open space in the Alternative. Both of these sites have been disturbed to some extent; the Ponderosa Golf course has been affected by grading and other activity to develop the golf course, and the Hirschdale Mine Site has been extensively modified by cindercone mining activity. For these reason, the Mixed Use and Outlying Open Space alternative would be considered equivalent to the proposed General Plan with regard to cultural resources.

e. Geology, Soils and Seismicity

The Alternative would allow about the same amount of residential and non-residential development as the proposed Plan. Furthermore, current State and federal regulations require specific mitigations to avoid impacts related to geologic and seismic hazards, which would apply to both the Alternative and the proposed General Plan. Thus, the Alternative is considered to be equivalent to the proposed General Plan.

f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Mixed-Use Alternative would allow for about the same amount of residential and non-residential development as the proposed plan, and with existing regulations in place that would apply to both the proposed Plan and the alternative, would render the level of impact equivalent between the two. Somewhat fewer people would be exposed to hazards such as flood, fire, and earthquake as the proposed Plan. As a result, the Mixed-Use Alternative would result in insubstantially better impacts than the 2025 General Plan.

g. Hydrology

The Mixed-Use Alternative would result in about the same amount of land converted to paved or impermeable surfaces, and would expose about the same number of people to flooding risk. All development under this alterna-

tive would be subject to the same General Plan policies and actions, as well as federal, State and local regulations as the 2025 General Plan, which would reduce the potential impacts on hydrology and water quality to less than significant levels, resulting in similar level of impact between the alternative and the proposed General Plan.

h. Land Use

Since the 2025 General Plan would not divide any existing communities, there would be no relative improvement under the alternative. The alternative would also be subject to the same General Plan policies and revised land use designations that would be more consistent with actual and projected uses in certain areas of Truckee. Therefore, the Mixed-Use Alternative would have a similar land use impact as the 2025 General Plan.

i. Noise

The Mixed-Use Alternative would result in about the same amount of development as the proposed Plan, but would also allow for mixed-use development on additional sites, creating more potential for noise-generating uses, and for incompatible uses to be located in proximity to each other. The 2025 General Plan would allow for residential development on the Ponderosa Golf Course site, which is relatively close to the airport and thus subject to aircraft noise. However, both the proposed Plan and the Mixed-Use Alternative would be subject to the same community noise standards, as well as to the specific requirements of the Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The Mixed-Use Alternative would thus have a similar noise impact as the 2025 General Plan.

j. Population, Employment, and Housing

The alternative and the proposed Plan would have roughly the same number of housing units and non-residential development, and would induce about the same planned population growth. Because of this, and since the alternative would also not cause displacement of housing and population, the Mixed-Use Alternative would result in the same population and housing impact as the 2025 General Plan.

k. Public Services

The Mixed Use Alternative would result in about the same amount of development as the 2025 General Plan, and about the same demand for public services. The alternative would include the same General Plan Policies to address the provision of public services and mitigation of potential impacts associated with the construction of new facilities. As a result, the Mixed-Use Alternative would result in the same public services impact as the 2025 General Plan.

l. Traffic and Circulation

The key impacts associated with the Mixed-Use Alternative include the need for potential reconstruction of the western Donner Pass Road/I-80 interchange and connection of Deerfield Drive associated with PC1 development; the widening of Donner Pass Road in the Gateway area associated with the development at PC1 and existing Middle School sites; and potentially significant negative impacts of the Pioneer Commerce Center area development on Downtown streets. Some of these impacts would occur with development of the proposed Plan (e.g. Deerfield Drive connection), but overall the impact of this alternative would be slightly worse than the proposed Plan.

m. Utilities and Infrastructure

The Mixed-Use Alternative would result in about the same amount of residential development, although there would be slightly more commercial and industrial uses allowed under the alternative. This would result in slightly greater, although likely negligible, increase in demand on utility systems. However, the alternative would include the same General Policies to address the provision of utilities and mitigation of potential impacts associated with the construction of new facilities. As a result, the Mixed-Use Alternative would result in about the same level of impact to utilities and infrastructure as the proposed Plan.

C. Economic Diversification Alternative

This section analyzes the Economic Diversification Alternative against the 2025 General Plan.

1. Principal Characteristics

This alternative focuses on job-generating commercial and industrial land uses, and has the most square feet of such development of the three project alternatives. Total residential development would be about 600 fewer units than the 2025 General Plan. This alternative would create the most number of jobs, with the goal of increasing high-wage and skilled employment for Truckee's workforce.

In this alternative, all development on PC-1 would be commercial or industrial; commercial uses would also be allowed on the Ponderosa Golf Course site, the Pioneer Commerce Center area (along with live-work units); and highway commercial development would be allowed on the SR 267/I-80/SR 89 North Triangle. An additional industrial area would be created near Joerger Drive, and industrial uses would be allowed on the Town Corporation Yard site, and near the Teichert Mine. Highway commercial uses would be allowed at Airport Flat, adjacent to the Interstate, with the remainder of the site designated as Open Space Recreation, allowing clustered residential and low-intensity recreation uses.

2. Impact Analysis

The Economic Diversification Alternative would have the following impacts relative to adoption of the 2025 General Plan.

a. Aesthetics and Visual Resources

The alternative would allow visually obtrusive highway commercial development, which by definition would be intended to attract the attention of motorists, adjacent to the scenic corridor along I-80 on Airport Flat and also at the SR 267/I-80/SR 89 North Triangle. The new industrial development that would be allowed at Joerger Drive would also potentially impact the

scenic qualities of the SR 267 corridor. Thus, the alternative would have substantially worse impacts than the proposed Plan with regard to aesthetics.

b. Air Quality

The additional non-residential development under this alternative would create a substantial amount of new traffic, resulting in increased emissions from vehicle exhaust and re-entrained road dust, in addition to potential increases in pollution from truck traffic and stationary sources. Therefore, this alternative would be substantially worse than the proposed Plan in regard to air quality.

c. Biological Resources

This alternative proposes development on the Ponderosa Golf Course, which could affect a known deer migration route; the proposed Plan would also allow development on this site. However, the alternative also proposes development on Airport Flat, and in the Teichert Mine Area. In the former case, this could affect wetlands and a sensitive plant species, and in the latter case, could affect Martis Creek. However, the alternative would include the same General Policies to address the protection of biological species and habitat. As a result, the Economic Diversification Alternative would result in similar impacts as the proposed Plan.

d. Cultural Resources

The Economic Diversification Alternative does propose a somewhat different distribution, and in some cases, more intense development than would be allowed under the proposed Plan, which could result in a greater potential to disturb cultural resources during project construction. However, both the Economic Diversification Alternative and the proposed General Plan would have in place similar protections regarding historic and cultural resources to the proposed General Plan and so would result in similar impacts.

e. Geology, Soils and Seismicity

Although the alternative would allow slightly more non-residential development than the proposed Plan, current State and federal regulations require

specific mitigations to avoid impacts related to geologic and seismic hazards. These would apply to both the Alternative and the proposed General Plan. For this reason, the Economic Diversification Alternative is considered to be equivalent to the proposed General Plan.

f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Economic Diversification Alternative would allow substantially more non-residential development than the proposed plan which could increase the amount of industrially generated and transported hazardous materials. However, existing regulations addressing the transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials would apply to both the proposed Plan and the Alternative, which would render the level of impact equivalent between the two. Somewhat fewer people would be exposed to hazards such as flood, fire, and earthquake as the proposed Plan. On balance, the Economic Diversification Alternative would result in an insubstantial improvement with regard to hazards over the 2025 General Plan.

g. Hydrology

The greater amount of industrial and commercial uses allowed under the Economic Diversification Alternative would likely create a larger paved footprint than the uses allowed under the proposed Plan, which could result in a larger amount of point-source and non-point source pollution. In addition, the industrial development allowed around the Teichert Mine might adversely affect Martis Creek. At the same time, all development under this alternative would be subject to the same General Plan policies and actions, as well as federal, State and local regulations as the 2025 General Plan, which would reduce the potential impacts on hydrology and water quality to less than significant levels, resulting in an insubstantially worse level of impact from the Alternative relative to the 2025 General Plan.

h. Land Use

Since the 2025 General Plan would not divide any existing communities, there would be no relative improvement under the alternative. The alternative would also be subject to the same General Plan policies and revised land use designa-

tions that would be more consistent with actual and projected uses in certain areas of Truckee. Therefore, the Economic Diversification Alternative would have a similar land use impact as the proposed General Plan.

i. Noise

As noted above, the alternatives land uses would be expected to generate additional vehicle traffic and concurrent noise levels relative to the proposed Plan, and potentially expose existing sensitive uses to increased noise levels. Although the additional industrial uses that would be allowed under the alternative could become new sources of noise in the community, none are located in areas of high sensitivity to noise, and all such uses (and adjacent uses) would be subject to the same community noise standards as the proposed Plan. As a result of increased traffic-related noise, the alternative would have a substantially worse level of impact compared to the 2025 General Plan.

j. Population, Employment, and Housing

The alternative would have fewer housing units, and substantially more employment-generating uses than the proposed Plan, resulting in a smaller population over the 20-year planning period, and more jobs. While the alternative would benefit Truckee's employment base, the smaller number of housing units would also make it more difficult for the Town to accommodate growth projected for the next 20 years, and to provide needed affordable and other housing opportunities. As with the proposed General Plan, this alternative itself would not require displacement of housing and population.

On balance, the Economic Diversification Alternative would result in the same population, employment and housing impacts as the 2025 General Plan.

k. Public Services

The smaller number of new residents associated with this alternative would result in lower demands for essential community services such as police and fire protection, and schools and parks, and decrease the likelihood that new facilities would be needed to service the additional increment of population.

The Economic Diversification Alternative is considered to be slightly better than the proposed Plan with regard to community services.

l. Traffic and Circulation

This alternative would generate the highest level of additional traffic in Truckee, with corresponding impacts to local roadways and need for additional improvements. In particular, it is anticipated that this alternative would require complete reconstruction of both the western Donner Pass Road interchange and Prosser Village interchange along I-80; widening of Donner Pass Road in the Gateway area; connection of Deerfield Drive, as well as construction of a second SR 267 bridge over the Truckee River to provide a total of four travel lanes. The impacts of this alternative are thus considered to be substantially worse than the proposed Plan.

m. Utilities and Infrastructure

The Economic Diversification Alternative would result in fewer housing units, and substantially more non-residential square footage. Depending on the mix of commercial and industrial uses developed, there could be additional demand on utilities systems. However, the alternative would include the same General Policies to address the provision of utilities and mitigation of potential impacts associated with the construction of new facilities. As a result, the Economic Diversification Alternative would result in the same utilities impact as the proposed Plan.

D. Increased Residential Development Alternative.

This section analyzes the Increased Residential Development Alternative against the 2025 General Plan.

1. Principal Characteristics

This alternative focuses on residential uses that could provide an increased range of housing opportunities, while also preserving open space in areas throughout Truckee. Of the three alternatives, this alternative provides the

highest number of housing units with some areas specifically designated for high- and medium density residential development in order to encourage affordability. There are also areas, mostly focused on the more outlying sites, that are designated for residential development at low and very-low densities.

The former Middle School site would be designated for high density housing; part of PC-1 and Ponderosa Golf Course would be designated for medium density housing, and residential densities would be increased in the areas around the Pioneer Commerce Center and at the Hirschdale Mine site (but would remain relatively low). Low density residential development would be allowed at the Corporation Yard and adjacent area, and very low-density development at Airport Flat. McIver Hill, Upper McIver Dairy, and the triangle and Alder Drive sites would be left as open space.

2. Impact Analysis

The Increased Residential Development Alternative would have the following impacts relative to adoption of the 2025 General Plan.

a. Aesthetics and Visual Resources

This alternative would have some reduced impacts with regard to the proposed Plan for some sites and increased impacts for others. The most significant improvements would be in the alternative's open space designations for McIver Hill, Upper McIver Dairy, and the two PC-2 sites, which would allow these sites to retain their natural appearance and scenic qualities. However, the alternative would allow for clustered residential development on Airport Flat, which could detract from the scenic qualities of the site if the development were not well sited. Increased residential densities at the Hirschdale Mine site might also impair the area's visual appearance. On balance, the alternative would therefore be about the same as the proposed Plan in regard to visual impacts.

b. Air Quality

This alternative would generate lower traffic volumes and so would have less impact than the 2025 General Plan with regard to vehicle emissions and air

pollution from re-entrained road dust. In addition, the alternative has the smallest amount of non-residential development, reducing potential contributions to air pollution from stationary sources. This alternative would therefore be significantly better than the proposed Plan with regard to air quality.

c. Biological Resources

The Increased Residential Development Alternative proposes the Alder Drive site and I-80/SR 267/SR 89 North Triangle site, and McIver Hill for open space. In each case this would allow forest habitat in the area to be preserved. Unlike the proposed Plan, the Increased Residential Development Alternative proposes clustered residential development for the Airport Flat area, which contains sensitive wetland resources and plant species. Since the alternative would be, an improvement in some instances, and in others would be more detrimental with regard to biological resource impacts, the alternative is, on balance, no better or worse than the Proposed Plan.

d. Cultural Resources

The Increased Residential Development Alternative does propose a somewhat different distribution, and in some cases, more intense development than would be allowed under the proposed Plan, which could result in more potential to disturb cultural resources during project construction. However, both the alternative and the proposed Plan would have in place similar protections regarding historic and cultural resources and so the Increased Residential Alternative would result in similar impacts as the proposed Plan.

e. Geology, Soils and Seismicity

Although the alternative would allow additional non-residential development compared to the proposed Plan, which could expose more people to geologic and seismic hazards, current State and federal regulations require specific mitigations to avoid impacts related to geologic and seismic hazards, which would apply to both the Alternative and the proposed General Plan. For this reason, the Increased Residential Development Alternative is considered to be equivalent to the proposed General Plan.

f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Increased Residential Development Alternative would allow substantially more residential development than the proposed plan which could increase the amount of household hazardous waste. However, existing regulations in place that would apply to both the proposed Plan and the alternative would render the level of impact equivalent between the two. The additional development could expose more people hazards compared to the 2025 Plan. On balance, the Increased Residential Alternative would be insubstantially worse than the 2025 General Plan.

g. Hydrology

The alternative allows for more residential development and less commercial and industrial development. In addition, more intense development would be allowed on some sites while open space would be maintained on some others, compared to the 2025 General Plan. However, all development under this alternative would be subject to the same General Plan policies and actions, as well as federal, State and local regulations as the 2025 General Plan. This would result in a similar level of impact from the Increased Residential Development Alternative relative to the 2025 General Plan.

h. Land Use

Since the 2025 General Plan would not divide any existing communities, there would be no relative improvement under the alternative. The alternative would also be subject to the same General Plan policies and revised land use designations that would be more consistent with actual and projected uses in certain areas of Truckee. Like the other alternatives, the Increased Residential Development Alternative would have a similar land use impact as the 2025 General Plan.

i. Noise

As noted above, the Increased Residential Development Alternative would generate less traffic than the proposed Plan, which would result in relatively lower traffic-related noise on local roadways. At the same time, the alternative would have fewer potentially noise generating non-residential uses than

the proposed plan. All uses allowed under the alternative and the proposed plan would be subject to the same community noise standards as the proposed Plan. The alternative would have an insubstantially better level of impact on noise compared to the 2025 General Plan.

j. Population, Employment, and Housing

The alternative's additional residential uses would provide additional housing opportunities for Truckee residents to accommodate projected population growth. Fewer employment opportunities would be provided with the alternative's reduced amount of non-residential development. As with the 2025 General Plan, this alternative itself would not require displacement of housing and population. As a result, and on balance, the Increased Residential Development Alternative would result in the same population, employment and housing impact as the 2025 General Plan.

k. Public Services

The Increased Residential Development Alternative would result in additional housing units and population, which would increase demands for public services. This alternative would include the same General Plan Policies to address the provision of public services and mitigation of potential impacts associated with the construction of new facilities. As a result, the Increased Residential Alternative would be insubstantially worse than the 2025 General Plan with regard to public services.

l. Traffic and Circulation

Due to the reduced amount of traffic that would be generated by this alternative, its impacts would be less than the proposed Plan. Like the proposed Plan, the alternative would have some impact on Downtown streets (in association with the Bridge Street Extension) and would require improvement to address existing operational deficiencies at the Glenshire Drive/Donner Pass Road intersection. The Increased Residential Alternative would result in an insubstantial improvement over the 2025 General Plan with regard to traffic and circulation.

m. Utilities and Infrastructure

The Increased Residential Development Alternative would result in additional housing units and population, but less non-residential development than the proposed Plan. The alternative would include the same General Plan Policies to address the provision of public services and mitigation of potential impacts associated with construction of new facilities. As a result, the Increased Residential Alternative would result in the same impacts to utilities and infrastructure as the 2025 General Plan.

E. Environmentally-Superior Alternative

CEQA requires the identification of the environmentally superior alternative in an EIR. Based on the above analysis, which is summarized in Table 5.2, the environmentally superior alternative is the Increased Residential Development Alternative. This alternative would lessen impacts to air quality, noise, and traffic and hence is environmentally superior to the 2025 General Plan.

However, the Increased Residential Development Alternative would not be able to provide the land needed for new industrial and commercial development that is foreseen by the Town of Truckee, would not provide a site for a future Community College, and would allow development at Airport Flat, which the Town has identified as a critical open space area that should be preserved. Since each of these aspects are identified in the 2025 General Plan as key objectives of the Plan, implementation of the alternative would not fulfill these objectives and would not be feasible to implement. For this reason, the Town of Truckee is moving forward with the 2025 General Plan Update.

TOWN OF TRUCKEE
GENERAL PLAN EIR
ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT