Section 8.0:

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

SECTION 8.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires the identification and evaluation of reasonable alternatives designed to feasibly achieve the most basic objectives of the project, while avoiding or substantially lessening any of the significant environmental effects of the project. In addition, CEQA requires a comparative evaluation of the merits of the alternatives.

Pursuant to Section 15126.6 (f)(1) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives include, but are not limited to, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). Although these factors do not present a strict limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives to be considered, they help establish the context in which "the rule of reason" is measured against when determining an appropriate range of alternatives sufficient to establish and foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.

THE FULLERTON PLAN PROCESS

It is important to discuss the General Plan update process, as that process lead to The Fullerton Plan Community Development Plan. The Community Development Plan divides the City into community development types (i.e., land use designations) that define areas of the City by type of use, existing neighborhood character, and intent of future growth.

The Fullerton Plan was developed through a process involving extensive community outreach, working sessions with City staff and department heads, meetings with the City's various commissions and committees, and dialogue with the City Council and citizen-based General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), as described below.

- ***Phase 1 – The Fullerton Plan Initiation and Education.*** This phase of the process focused on understanding existing conditions within Fullerton and introducing community members to the General Plan and the process of updating the General Plan. This Phase included appointing the GPAC, conducting General Plan education programs, hosting a virtual community open house, facilitating a public agency forum.

- ***Phase 2 – Community Visioning.*** This phase involved extensive outreach to the community in order to understand their issues, concerns, and visions for Fullerton. A variety of opportunities and formats for participation were provided including visioning charrettes, youth workshops, telephone and online surveys, roadshow presentations, commission and committee meetings, visioning open house, neighborhood meetings, land use futures open house, GPAC meetings, and Planning Commission and City

Council meetings. This phase culminated in the approval of The Fullerton Vision and identification of the Focus Areas.

- ***Phase 3 – The Fullerton Plan Development***. During the third phase, The Fullerton Plan was drafted, which includes goals, policies, and actions reviewed and approved by the GPAC. The Fullerton Plan was made available for review by the public prior to being considered for adoption by the Planning Commission and City Council.

Determination of Alternatives to Be Analyzed

Key factors used to determine the range of feasible alternatives to The Fullerton Plan, as proposed, include the objectives established for the EIR process, along with the vision identified for The Fullerton Plan.

The basic objectives of The Fullerton Plan and EIR are set forth specifically and in detail in Section 3.0, Project Description. With these factors in mind, the following alternatives have been identified for detailed analysis in this section:

- No Project/Existing General Plan;
- Reduced Focus Areas Alternative; and
- Reduced Growth Alternative.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Throughout the following analysis, impacts of alternatives are examined for each of the issue areas examined in Section 5.0 of this EIR. In this manner, each alternative can be compared to The Fullerton Plan, as proposed, on an issue-by-issue basis. Each alternative's impacts are compared to Fullerton Plan.

Only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are relevant in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to The Fullerton Plan. The Fullerton Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts in the following environmental issue areas:

Land Use and Planning

- Consistency with Airport Environs Land Use Plan (AELUP) for Fullerton Municipal Airport

Traffic and Circulation

- General Plan Update Traffic Operations
- Consistency with the Congestion Management Plan
- Cumulative Traffic Operations

Air Quality

- Short-Term Construction Emissions
- Long-Term Mobile and Stationary Source Emissions
- Cumulative Air Quality
  - Construction
  - Regional Air Quality

Noise

- Cumulative Long-Term Operational Noise – Mobile Sources
  - Gilbert Street north of Rosecrans Avenue
  - Associated Road between Bastanchury Road and Yorba Linda Boulevard

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Airport Safety Hazards

Implementation of the identified policies, actions, or mitigation measures can mitigate all other potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. This section considers alternatives to otherwise avoid or minimize these significant and unavoidable impacts. A description of each alternative and a comparative environmental evaluation to the impacts identified for The Fullerton Plan is provided below.

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

8.2 NO PROJECT/ EXISTING GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE

8.2.1 DESCRIPTION

As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (e), the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative describes buildout of the City of Fullerton in accordance with existing zoning and General Plan land use designations and policies of the current General Plan, which was adopted in 1996 (refer to Exhibit 5.1-1, Land Use Map – 1996 General Plan). This Alternative assumes that the existing General Plan would continue to provide outdated information regarding several issues, such as land uses, traffic conditions, community noise levels, air quality data, public services and utilities levels of service, and population, employment and housing.

This Alternative assumes that ultimate buildout of the existing General Plan would occur. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative encompasses the same geographic area as The Fullerton Plan. The Fullerton Plan proposes revisions to the Existing General Plan, as outlined in Section 3.5, Project Characteristics. Table 8-1, *No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative Compared to The Fullerton Plan*, compares the buildout potential associated with the existing General Plan (1996) and The Fullerton Plan.

Table 8-1
No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative Compared to The Fullerton Plan

Land Use Plan	Dwelling Units	Non-Residential (SF)
Existing General Plan (1996)[1]	49,662	54,203,268
The Fullerton Plan	56,130	56,307,474
Existing General Plan (1996): The Fullerton Plan Difference	**-6,468**	**-2,104,206**
Source: Fullerton General Plan EIR, Table 3-6 (Land Use Summary).		

As indicated in Table 8-1, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would allow for the following when compared to The Fullerton Plan:

- 6,468 fewer dwelling units; and
- 2,104,206 fewer square feet of non-residential uses.

8.2.2 IMPACT EVALUATION

LAND USE AND PLANNING

One of the objectives of The Fullerton Plan is to communicate “Areas of Change” in order to convey those parts of Fullerton that are envisioned to largely remain unchanged and those where change is anticipated or planned and to identify “Focus Areas” (i.e., Focus Area Overlay) to more specifically identify those parts of Fullerton where potential change is anticipated or planned. Additionally, The Fullerton Plan establishes allowable residential densities and non-residential intensities and creates two new community development types (i.e., Neighborhood Center Mixed-Use and Urban Center Mixed-Use) to accommodate higher density/intensity desired for specific areas of the City. Although existing land uses would remain relatively unchanged under The Fullerton Plan, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative land use designations do not adequately address the land use vision for the City.

Under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, the existing Land Use Element would continue to provide outdated information that does not reflect the current conditions or goals of the City. This Alternative would prevent the City from achieving some of the core objectives of The Fullerton Plan, including focusing development within specific areas of the City. The Fullerton Plan proposes two new community development types, providing opportunities for higher density/intensity mixed-use development. Although wholesale land use changes are not proposed, The Fullerton Plan would change the land use designations for 152 parcels to resolve inconsistencies between the parcels’ current General Plan land use designation and current

zoning district. This would not occur with the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative; thus, land use and zoning inconsistencies would continue to occur.

The Fullerton Plan establishes the policy foundation to address current and anticipated buildout conditions over the next 20 years. The Fullerton Plan addresses current planning issues, providing for better consistency with regional plans and programs, such as SCAG. The existing inconsistency impact with the Airport Environs Land Use Plan (AELUP) for Fullerton Municipal Airport would continue to occur with this Alternative, similar to The Fullerton Plan. Overall, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to The Fullerton Plan.

POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

Two objectives of The Fullerton Plan are to update the City's environmental baseline conditions to 2010 and to update the General Plan development projections to the year 2030 for dwelling units, non-residential square footage, population, and employment. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative does not reflect the most current population, employment, and housing numbers or projections, nor does it provide quantitative population, employment, and housing projections for future years. The existing General Plan was adopted in 1996, and therefore does not address current conditions or plan for anticipated growth within the City over the next 20 years. In contrast, The Fullerton Plan reflects the current priorities of the City, providing community design guidance and establishing the framework for future community-based planning efforts for key focus areas within the City. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative does not provide for the type and intensity of non-residential development within specific Focus Areas of the City in order to achieve the community's vision to the extent of The Fullerton Plan. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

AESTHETICS AND LIGHT/GLARE

Both the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would allow for increased development within the City through the development of vacant land, infill development, and redevelopment of currently developed sites. The Fullerton Plan has identified Focus Areas within the City for focused planning efforts and future development. The Fullerton Plan anticipates two levels of potential change within the Focus Areas. Areas identified as "strategically improve and evolve" are anticipated to experience moderate to significant change. Areas identified as "transform" are anticipated to experience significant change. Development of the Focus Areas as envisioned by The Fullerton Plan would change the current character or sense of place beyond existing conditions. Although the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would allow for development within these areas, it does not establish the policy framework for focused planning efforts that would guide future development within key areas of the City. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not address the visual character of future development to the extent of The Fullerton Plan. The Fullerton Plan establishes a vision for the future character of these areas and provides policies and actions that provide for compatibility of design and uses and sense of place in order to ensure alterations to the existing environment would not degrade the existing visual character/quality of the respective development sites and their surroundings. Thus, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

As indicated in Section 5.4, Traffic and Circulation, all study intersections are currently operating at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better for City intersections and LOS E for CMP facilities), with the exception of the following intersections:

- Yorba Linda Boulevard and Associated Road; and
- La Palma Avenue and State College Boulevard.

With implementation of The Fullerton Plan, 35 intersections would operate at an unacceptable LOS based on the City's performance criteria. It is anticipated that similar significant impacts would occur under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative due to the growth allowed by the existing General Plan, as well as regional traffic. The Fullerton Plan provides two new community development types that allow for mixed-use development at higher densities, allowing for more concentrated development that would reduce the need for vehicular trips within the area and encourage pedestrian activity. Further, The Fullerton Plan proposes policies and actions that would encourage transit oriented development and support alternative modes of transportation, including an improved bikeways network, and pedestrian amenities that encourage walking and enhance the pedestrian experience. Specifically, The Fullerton Plan supports land use and zoning changes that would provide access to daily retail needs, recreational facilities, and transit stops within a walkable distance (i.e., a quarter- to a half-mile) of established residential uses. The vision for future community-based planning efforts within the Focus Areas would further contribute to improved multi-modal opportunities within key areas of the City. Although significant unavoidable traffic impacts are identified under The Fullerton Plan, it is anticipated that future planning efforts associated with the Focus Areas would provide opportunities to reduce traffic and associated impacts within the areas that would not occur with the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative. Thus, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

AIR QUALITY

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would allow for new development on existing vacant land or through redevelopment of currently developed land, similar to The Fullerton Plan. Although the amount and intensity of development would be greater under The Fullerton Plan, development under either the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would result in significant unavoidable impacts related to short-term construction-related emissions, long-term operational emissions, and cumulative construction and operational impacts. All other air quality impacts associated with The Fullerton Plan and No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative can be mitigated to less than significant levels. However, The Fullerton Plan policies and actions provide for greater opportunities to protect and improve air quality, including updated policies and actions that reflect current regulatory requirements, as well as providing opportunities for a better jobs/housing balance to reduce vehicle miles traveled, encouraging energy conservation and expanded transit opportunities, and providing future opportunities to developed mixed-use and transit-oriented developments. Thus, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

NOISE

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would allow for new development on existing vacant land or through redevelopment of currently developed land, similar to The Fullerton Plan. Although the amount and intensity of development would be greater under The Fullerton Plan, development under either the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would result in additional noise from construction activities and the resulting increase in traffic associated with future development. Cumulative long-term operational noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable due to anticipated City growth, along with cumulative growth outside the City. Thus, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Development under either the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would potentially result in new development (i.e., new residential and non-residential land uses), thereby resulting in an increase in population. Potential new development would be located throughout the City and would result in a larger number of structures/people potentially exposed to substantial adverse effects associated with severe ground shaking or ground failure. However, impacts related to geologic and seismic hazards associated with either the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would be less than significant by adherence to and/or compliance with building codes and standards and the goals and policies. However, it should be noted that the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would allow the development of fewer residential units and non-residential square footage than The Fullerton Plan. Therefore, the number of people or structures that would potentially be exposed to seismic hazards would be reduced with this Alternative. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would allow for new development of vacant land and increased densities/intensities, potentially resulting in increased development that could result in hydrology, drainage, or water quality impacts. The Fullerton Plan would allow for greater development when compared to the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, potentially resulting in greater hydrology, drainage and water quality impacts. Buildout of The Fullerton Plan would involve greater development and potentially greater demand for groundwater resources due to increased growth and decreased reliance of imported water supplies, when compared to the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative. The Fullerton Plan includes policies and actions that address stormwater management and water quality, as well as conservation of water resources in order to reduce potential impacts. These policies and actions provide for increased protection and provide updated and current information regarding stormwater and water quality requirements. However, compliance with the regulatory requirements and existing goals and policies would reduce impacts to a less than significant level under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative. Since the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would allow for less development than The Fullerton Plan, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally superior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would potentially result in the expansion or development of facilities that could impact the health and safety of Fullerton residents and employees. Both the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative and The Fullerton Plan provide goals and policies to reduce the potential threat associated with hazardous material use, disposal, and transport. The two new community development types (i.e., Neighborhood Center Mixed-Use and Urban Center Mixed-Use) proposed by The Fullerton Plan would allow for the future development of mixed-uses, including the placement of residential and non-residential uses in proximity to each other. These non-residential uses may involve the storage and/or use of hazardous materials. Although The Fullerton Plan provides guidance on utilizing these two new community development types, they will only be implemented as part of future land use planning efforts in applicable Focus Areas and the Community Development Plan does not use these community development types at this time. Future designation of land and development consistent with these community development types would be reviewed for consistency with The Fullerton Plan, which includes policies and actions for protection related to potential hazards and hazardous materials. The existing hazard associated with residential, industrial, or commercial parcels being located within Fullerton Municipal Airport's Runway Protection Zone (Clear Zone) (RPZ) and Accident Potential Zones (APZ) would continue to occur under both The Fullerton Plan and No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally inferior nor superior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would allow for new development on existing vacant land, infill development, and redevelopment of currently developed properties. Therefore, potential impacts to known or unknown/undiscovered historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative or The Fullerton Plan. However, impacts related to cultural resources associated with either the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would be less than significant by adherence to and/or compliance with the goals and policies of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative or Fullerton Plan, respectively and mitigation measures. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would allow for new development of vacant land within the West Coyote Hills Specific Plan area, which is known to contain biological resources. Therefore, potential impacts to habit modifications of any species identified as sensitive or special status species, riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, federally protected wetlands, movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species would be similar under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative or The Fullerton Plan. It is anticipated that impacts related to biological resources associated with either the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would be less than significant by adherence to and/or compliance with the current regulatory requirements, the goals and policies

of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative or The Fullerton Plan, respectively, and mitigation measures. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative does not represent the true level of service demand based on current conditions. Implementation of The Fullerton Plan would provide a comprehensive inventory of existing public services and utilities and the levels of service provided to the City. Growth associated with The Fullerton Plan would exceed the growth anticipated with the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative. Therefore, the level of service and demand for service would be less with the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative than The Fullerton Plan. Although, goals, policies, and actions in The Fullerton Plan would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered superior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

In accordance with AB 32, the City would be required to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Development pursuant to the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in additional GHG emissions with future development, similar to The Fullerton Plan. The City has prepared a Climate Action Plan (CAP) as part of The Fullerton Plan to address GHG emissions reduction within the City. The strategies identified in the CAP contain emission reduction measures from municipal and non-municipal operations. These measures are consistent with and build upon the goals, policies, and actions within The Fullerton Plan. The strategies identified in the CAP would achieve the desired reduction target of 15 percent below baseline levels by 2020 under The Fullerton Plan. Since the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative does not include goals, policies, and actions that would address GHG emissions reductions within the City to the extent of The Fullerton Plan, it is possible that the City would not meet its reduction targets of AB 32 under this Alternative, resulting in a significant impact. Thus, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

CONCLUSION

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in similar environmental impacts as The Fullerton Plan for noise, hazards and hazardous materials, cultural resources, and biological resources. However, this Alternative may generate higher impacts than The Fullerton Plan with respect to land use, population, housing, and employment, aesthetics, traffic and circulation, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions. This Alternative would generate fewer impacts than The Fullerton Plan with respect to geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and public services and utilities. It is the intent of The Fullerton Plan to provide new information based on current conditions within the City and to provide goals, policies, and actions that address current conditions. The conditions evaluated under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not serve the City as effectively as The Fullerton Plan and provides environmental data that is inferior to The Fullerton Plan. Additionally, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not provide the vision for the Focus Areas and policy direction to achieve the objectives of The Fullerton Plan, which focus on communicating the “Vision for

Fullerton" through a Vision Statement to establish a community-based foundation that captures the City's qualities, values, and characteristics, now and in the future; updating the Land Use Element (i.e., Community Development and Design Chapter), including the establishment of allowable residential densities and non-residential intensities; creating two new community development types (i.e., Neighborhood Center Mixed-Use and Urban Center Mixed-Use) given the 1996 General Plan land use designations do not encompass the higher end of the density/intensity range now desired for specific areas of the City; establishing guiding principles, derived from the community's vision for Fullerton; updating General Plan development projections to the year; and communicating "Focus Areas" (i.e., Focus Area Overlay) through a citywide Focus Area Map to more specifically identify those parts of Fullerton where potential change is anticipated or planned. Thus, this Alternative would not meet the goals of The Fullerton Plan.

8.3 THE FULLERTON PLAN WITH REDUCED FOCUS AREAS ALTERNATIVE

8.3.1 DESCRIPTION

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative assumes that The Fullerton Plan would be adopted, as proposed, with the exception of the Airport Industrial, North Industrial, and Southeast Industrial Focus Areas. These areas would not be identified as Focus Areas within The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative. Additional growth (residential and non-residential) associated with the Airport Industrial, North Industrial, and Southeast Industrial areas would not occur. As a result, this Alternative assumes the anticipated growth would be reduced when compared to The Fullerton Plan. Table 8-2, *The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative Compared to The Fullerton Plan*, compares the buildout potential associated with The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative and The Fullerton Plan.

Table 8-2
The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative Compared to The Fullerton Plan

Land Use Plan	Dwelling Units	Non-Residential (SF)
The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative	54,703	52,046,244
The Fullerton Plan	56,130	56,307,474
The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative: The Fullerton Plan Difference	**-1,427**	**-4,261,230**

Source: Fullerton General Plan EIR, Table 3-6 (Land Use Summary).

As indicated in Table 8-2, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would allow for the following when compared to The Fullerton Plan:

- 1,427 fewer dwelling units; and
- 4,261,230 fewer square feet of non-residential uses.

8.3.2 IMPACT EVALUATION

LAND USE AND PLANNING

As with The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative revises and updates the existing Land Use Element, including establishing Focus Areas for future growth that reflect the future vision and priorities of the City. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative proposes the introduction of two new community development types (i.e., Neighborhood Center Mixed-Use and Urban Center Mixed-Use), similar to The Fullerton Plan. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative provides updated land use information for the City. Although wholesale land use changes are not proposed, similar to The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would change the land use designations for 152 parcels to resolve inconsistencies between the parcels' current General Plan land use designation and current zoning district. Further, it establishes the policy foundation to address current and anticipated buildout conditions over the next 20 years.

Under The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative, the existing Land Use Element would be updated to reflect the current conditions or goals of the City. Similar to The Fullerton Plan, this Alternative would support the City in achieving its core objectives, including focusing development within specific areas of the City; however, to a lesser degree than The Fullerton Plan. This Alternative would establish the policy foundation to address current and anticipated buildout conditions over the next 20 years. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would address current planning issues, providing for better consistency with regional plans and programs, such as SCAG. The existing inconsistency impact with the Airport Environs Land Use Plan (AELUP) for Fullerton Municipal Airport would continue to occur with this Alternative, similar to The Fullerton Plan. In this regard, Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan.

POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would update the City's environmental baseline conditions and update development projections to the year 2030, similar to The Fullerton Plan. Development projections include projections for dwelling units, non-residential square footage, population, and employment. This Alternative would provide the most current population, housing, and employment numbers or projections, and quantitative population, employment, and housing projections for future years. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would reflect the current trend of Orange County, and overall regional development, as identified by SCAG. SCAG projects that the City's population will reach 152,494 persons by 2030. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is projected to result in a population of approximately 161,100 persons at buildout (2030), which is approximately 5.6 percent greater than SCAG's forecast. Similarly, the City's projected housing

stock would be approximately 9.9 percent greater than SCAG forecasts. Similar to The Fullerton Plan, although the City's population and housing growth would be greater than projected by SCAG, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would not conflict with SCAG's forecasts. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative accounts for the population growth and establishes Goals and Policies to reduce potential growth-related impacts. The Growth Management Element is intended to ensure that infrastructure planning meets the needs of current and future residents of Fullerton by setting forth policy related to growth management and providing implementation and monitoring provisions. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

AESTHETICS AND LIGHT/GLARE

Both The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would allow for increased development within the City through the development of vacant land, infill development, and redevelopment of currently developed sites. Similar to The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative identifies Focus Areas for future planning efforts within the City. Two levels of potential change within the Focus Areas are identified. Areas identified as "strategically improve and evolve" are anticipated to experience moderate to significant change. Areas identified as "transform" are anticipated to experience significant change. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would involve fewer Focus Areas when compared to The Fullerton Plan. Specifically, the Airport Industrial, North Industrial, and Southeast Industrial areas would not be identified as Focus Areas, and new growth within these areas would not occur. Overall, development of the Focus Areas as envisioned by The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would change the current character or sense of place beyond existing conditions, similar to The Fullerton Plan. Although The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative identifies fewer Focus Areas when compared to The Fullerton Plan, this Alternative would provide the vision and policy framework for future community-based planning efforts within key areas of the City. The goals, policies, and actions would address the visual character and future development within the Focus Areas. Similar to The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would provide policies and actions that provide for compatibility of design and uses and sense of place in order to ensure alterations to the existing environment would not degrade the existing visual character/quality of the respective development sites and their surroundings. Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would allow for new development on existing vacant land or through redevelopment of currently developed land, similar to The Fullerton Plan. However, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would result in less development when compared to The Fullerton Plan. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative assumes no new growth would occur within the Airport Industrial, North Industrial, and Southeast Industrial Focus Areas, resulting in 50,688 fewer daily trips, 4,728 fewer AM peak hour trips, and 5,308 fewer PM peak hour trips when compared to The Fullerton Plan. Under The Fullerton Plan, several study intersections would operate at an unacceptable LOS assuming complete buildout of the Focus Areas and limited reductions in traffic associated

with other modes of travel that are anticipated to occur with implementation of The Fullerton Plan. Intersection impacts within and immediately adjacent to the Airport Industrial, North Industrial, and Southeast Industrial Focus Areas would be reduced when compared to The Fullerton Plan, as new growth would not occur within these areas under The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative. As with The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative encourages new and/or improved transit operations within the City, as well as accessibility between major uses and users and an improved bicycle network. Other alternative modes of transportation, including walking are also encouraged. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative proposes policies and actions that would support and encourage the use of alternative transportation and ensure that adequate alternative transportation is available to serve demand. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is considered environmentally superior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

AIR QUALITY

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would allow for new development on existing vacant land or through redevelopment of currently developed land, similar to The Fullerton Plan. Although new development under The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would be reduced when compared to The Fullerton Plan, significant unavoidable impacts related to construction-related emissions, regional operational emissions, and cumulative construction and operational impacts would continue to occur. All other air quality impacts associated with The Fullerton Plan and The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative can be mitigated to less than significant levels. Although The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would incrementally reduce construction-related emissions and regional operational emissions when compared to The Fullerton Plan, the significant unavoidable impact would not be eliminated. Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

NOISE

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would allow for new development on existing vacant land or through redevelopment of currently developed land, similar to The Fullerton Plan. Development under either The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would result in additional noise from construction activities and the resulting increase in traffic associated with future development. Further, both The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would introduce new mixed-use community development types, allowing for more intense development. Similar to The Fullerton Plan, cumulative long-term operational noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable with The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative due to the redistribution of traffic on City streets associated with the anticipated growth, along with cumulative growth outside the City. All other noise impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels. Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Development under The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would potentially result in new development (i.e., new residential and non-residential land uses), thereby resulting in an increase in population. Potential new development would be located throughout the City and would result in a larger number of structures/people potentially exposed to substantial adverse effects associated with severe ground shaking or ground failure. However, compliance with building codes and standards would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would allow for development of fewer residential units and non-residential development when compared to The Fullerton Plan. Therefore, the potential impacts associated with the number of people or structures potentially exposed to seismic hazards would be less with this Alternative. Therefore, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would allow for new development on existing vacant and underutilized land, or intensification of currently developed land, potentially resulting in increased population and development that could result in hydrology, drainage, or water quality impacts. Buildout under either The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would result in increased demand for groundwater resources due to increased growth and decreased reliance of imported water supplies. The Natural Environment Element includes goals, policies, and actions that address stormwater management and water quality to ensure that potential impacts would be reduced, which would be applicable to this Alternative. Since The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would involve the development of fewer residential and nonresidential uses than The Fullerton Plan, potential hydrology, drainage, or water quality impacts would be reduced with this Alternative. Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would be considered environmental superior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Implementation of The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would result in the expansion or development of facilities that could impact the health and safety of Fullerton residents and employees. Both The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would provide for a mixed-use land use designation that could potentially allow for mixed-use development in the future, including the placement of residential and non-residential uses in proximity to each other. These non-residential uses may involve the storage and/or use of hazardous materials. Implementation of goals, policies, and actions would minimize risk under both The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative and The Fullerton Plan. However, the existing hazard associated with residential, industrial, or commercial parcels being located within Fullerton Municipal Airport's Runway Protection Zone (Clear Zone) (RPZ) and Accident Potential Zones (APZ) would continue to occur under both The Fullerton Plan and No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative. Therefore, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would allow for new development on existing vacant land. Therefore, potential impacts to known or unknown/undiscovered historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources would be similar under The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative or The Fullerton Plan. However, impacts related to cultural resources associated with either The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would be less than significant by adherence to and/or compliance with the goals, policies, and actions of The Fullerton Plan and mitigation measures. Therefore, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would allow for new development of vacant land within the West Coyote Hills Focus Area, which is known to contain biological resources. Therefore, potential impacts to habit modifications of any species identified as sensitive or special status species, riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, federally protected wetlands, movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species would be similar under The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative or The Fullerton Plan. It is anticipated that impacts related to biological resources associated with either The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would be less than significant by adherence to and/or compliance with the current regulatory requirements, the goals, policies, and actions of The Fullerton Plan and mitigation measures. Therefore, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to and The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Similar to The Fullerton Plan, implementation of The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would provide a comprehensive inventory of existing public services and utilities and the levels of service provided to the City. Growth associated with both The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would result in increased demand for public services and utilities beyond existing conditions. Goals, policies, and actions in The Fullerton Plan would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. However, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would allow for the development of fewer residential and non-residential uses when compared to The Fullerton Plan. This would result in less demand on public services and utilities. Because The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would result in an overall reduced demand for public services and utilities when compared to The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is considered environmentally superior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

In accordance with AB 32, the City would be required to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Development pursuant to The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would result in additional GHG emissions with future development, similar to The Fullerton Plan. The City has prepared a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to address GHG emissions reduction within

the City, which would also be applicable to this Alternative. The strategies identified in the CAP contain emission reduction measures from municipal and non-municipal operations. These measures are consistent with and build upon the goals, policies, and actions within The Fullerton Plan. The strategies identified in the CAP would achieve the desired reduction target of 15 percent below baseline levels by 2020. Therefore, similar to The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would be consistent with the reduction targets of AB 32, resulting in a less than significant impact. Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

CONCLUSION

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would result in similar environmental impacts as The Fullerton Plan for land use, population, employment, and housing, aesthetics, air quality, noise, hazards and hazardous materials, cultural resources, biological resources, and greenhouse gas emission. This Alternative would generate fewer impacts than The Fullerton Plan with respect to traffic and circulation, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and public services and utilities. It is the intent of The Fullerton Plan to provide new information based on current conditions within the City and to provide goals, policies, and actions that address current conditions. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would provide updated environmental data and goals, policies, and actions that address current and future conditions, similar to The Fullerton Plan. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would provide the vision to achieve the objectives of The Fullerton Plan, which focuses on communicating the “Vision for Fullerton” through a Vision Statement to establish a community-based foundation that captures the City’s qualities, values, and characteristics, now and in the future; updating the Land Use Element (i.e., Community Development and Design Chapter), including the establishment of allowable residential densities and non-residential intensities; creating two new community development types (i.e., Neighborhood Center Mixed-Use and Urban Center Mixed-Use) given the 1996 General Plan land use designations do not encompass the higher end of the density/intensity range now desired for specific areas of the City; establishing guiding principles, derived from the community’s vision for Fullerton; updating General Plan development projections to the year 2030; and communicating “Focus Areas” (i.e., Focus Area Overlay) through a citywide Focus Area Map to more specifically identify those parts of Fullerton where potential change is anticipated or planned. This Alternative would generally meet the goals of The Fullerton Plan.

8.4 THE FULLERTON PLAN WITH REDUCED GROWTH ALTERNATIVE

8.4.1 DESCRIPTION

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative assumes that The Fullerton Plan would be adopted, as proposed, however the amount of growth that would occur within any of the Focus Areas would be reduced when compared to The Fullerton Plan. Overall, the growth anticipated with The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would occur at lower densities and intensities when compared to The Fullerton Plan. However, this Alternative assumes the reduction in growth could occur within any of the Focus Areas. Table 8-3, *The Fullerton Plan*

with Reduced Growth Alternative Compared to The Fullerton Plan, compares the buildout potential associated with The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative and The Fullerton Plan.

Table 8-3
The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative Compared to The Fullerton Plan

Land Use Plan	Dwelling Units	Non-Residential (SF)
The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative	53,324	54,618,249
The Fullerton Plan	56,130	56,307,474
The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative: The Fullerton Plan Difference	**-2,836**	**-1,689,225**
Source: Fullerton General Plan EIR, Table 3-6 (Land Use Summary).		

As indicated in Table 8-3, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would allow for the following when compared to The Fullerton Plan:

- 2,836 fewer dwelling units; and
- 1,689,225 fewer square feet of non-residential uses.

8.4.2 IMPACT EVALUATION

LAND USE AND PLANNING

As with The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative revises and updates the existing Land Use Element, including establishing Focus Areas for future growth that reflect the future vision and priorities of the City. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative proposes the introduction of two new community development types (i.e., Neighborhood Center Mixed-Use and Urban Center Mixed-Use), similar to The Fullerton Plan. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative provides updated land use information for the City. Although wholesale land use changes are not proposed, similar to The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would change the land use designations for 152 parcels to resolve inconsistencies between the parcels' current General Plan land use designation and current zoning district. Further, it establishes the policy foundation to address current and anticipated buildout conditions over the next 20 years.

Under The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative, the existing Land Use Element would be updated to reflect the current conditions or goals of the City. Similar to The Fullerton Plan, this Alternative would support the City in achieving its core objectives, including focusing development within specific areas of the City; however, to a lesser degree than The Fullerton Plan. This Alternative would establish the policy foundation to address current and anticipated buildout conditions over the next 20 years. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would address current planning issues, providing for better consistency with regional plans and programs, such as SCAG. The existing inconsistency impact with the Airport Environs Land

Use Plan (AELUP) for Fullerton Municipal Airport would continue to occur with this Alternative, similar to The Fullerton Plan. In this regard, Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan.

POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would update the City's environmental baseline conditions and update development projections to the year 2030, similar to The Fullerton Plan. Development projections include projections for dwelling units, non-residential square footage, population, and employment. This Alternative would provide the most current population, housing, and employment numbers or projections, and quantitative population, employment, and housing projections for future years. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would reflect the current trend of Orange County, and overall regional development, as identified by SCAG. SCAG projects that the City's population will reach 152,494 persons by 2030. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative is projected to result in a population of approximately 157,039 persons at buildout (2030), which is approximately 3.0 percent greater than SCAG's forecast. Similarly, the City's projected housing stock would be approximately 7.2 percent greater than SCAG forecasts. Similar to The Fullerton Plan, although the City's population and housing growth would be greater than projected by SCAG, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would not conflict with SCAG's forecasts. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative accounts for the population growth and establishes Goals and Policies to reduce potential growth-related impacts. The Growth Management Element is intended to ensure that infrastructure planning meets the needs of current and future residents of Fullerton by setting forth policy related to growth management and providing implementation and monitoring provisions. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

AESTHETICS AND LIGHT/GLARE

Both The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would allow for increased development within the City through the development of vacant land, infill development, and redevelopment of currently developed sites. Similar to The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative identifies Focus Areas for future planning efforts within the City. Two levels of potential change within the Focus Areas are identified. Areas identified as "strategically improve and evolve" are anticipated to experience moderate to significant change. Areas identified as "transform" are anticipated to experience significant change. The Focus Areas identified for future planning efforts would be the same under The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative and The Fullerton Plan. Overall, development of the Focus Areas as envisioned by The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would change the current character or sense of place beyond existing conditions, similar to The Fullerton Plan. Although The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would allow less growth when compared to The Fullerton Plan, this Alternative would provide the vision and policy framework for future community-based planning efforts within key areas of the City. The goals, policies, and actions would address the visual character and future development within the Focus Areas. Similar to The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would provide policies and actions that provide for compatibility of design and uses and sense of place in order to ensure alterations to the existing environment would not degrade the existing visual character/quality of the respective development sites and their surroundings.

Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would allow for new development on existing vacant land or through redevelopment of currently developed land, similar to The Fullerton Plan. However, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would result in less development when compared to The Fullerton Plan. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative assumes less growth would occur within the Focus Areas, resulting in slightly fewer daily and peak hour trips when compared to The Fullerton Plan. Under The Fullerton Plan, several study intersections would operate at an unacceptable LOS assuming complete buildout of the Focus Areas and limited reductions in traffic associated with other modes of travel that are anticipated to occur with implementation of The Fullerton Plan. Similar impacts would occur under The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative. As with The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative encourages new and/or improved transit operations within the City, as well as accessibility between major uses and users and an improved bicycle network. Other alternative modes of transportation, including walking are also encouraged. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative proposes policies and actions that would support and encourage the use of alternative transportation and ensure that adequate alternative transportation is available to serve demand. Although The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would result in an overall reduction in traffic when compared to The Fullerton Plan, the reduction would be distributed amongst all of the Focus Areas and is not anticipated to eliminate the significant unavoidable traffic impacts identified with The Fullerton Plan. Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

AIR QUALITY

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would allow for new development on existing vacant land or through redevelopment of currently developed land, similar to The Fullerton Plan. Development under either The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would result in significant unavoidable impacts related to construction-related emissions, regional operational emissions, and cumulative construction and operational impacts. All other air quality impacts associated with The Fullerton Plan and The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative can be mitigated to less than significant levels. Although The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would incrementally reduce construction-related emissions and regional operational emissions when compared to The Fullerton Plan, the significant unavoidable impact would not be eliminated. Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

NOISE

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would allow for new development on existing vacant land or through redevelopment of currently developed land, similar to The Fullerton Plan. Development under either The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would result in additional noise from construction activities and the

resulting increase in traffic associated with future development. Further, both The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would introduce new mixed-use community development types, allowing for more intense development. Similar to The Fullerton Plan, cumulative long-term operational noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable with The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative due to the redistribution of traffic on City streets associated with the anticipated growth, along with cumulative growth outside the City. All other noise impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels. Although The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would incrementally reduce cumulative long-term operation noise, the significant unavoidable impact would not be eliminated. Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Development under The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would potentially result in new development (i.e., new residential and non-residential land uses), thereby resulting in an increase in population. Potential new development would be located throughout the City and would result in a larger number of structures/people potentially exposed to substantial adverse effects associated with severe ground shaking or ground failure. However, compliance with building codes and standards would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would allow for development of fewer residential units and non-residential development when compared to The Fullerton Plan. Therefore, the potential impacts associated with the number of people or structures potentially exposed to seismic hazards would be less with this Alternative. Therefore, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would allow for new development on existing vacant and underutilized land, or intensification of currently developed land, potentially resulting in increased population and development that could result in hydrology, drainage, or water quality impacts. Buildout under either The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would result in increased demand for groundwater resources due to increased growth and decreased reliance of imported water supplies. The Natural Environment Element includes goals, policies, and actions that address stormwater management and water quality to ensure that potential impacts would be reduced, which would be applicable to this Alternative. Since The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would involve the development of fewer residential and nonresidential uses than The Fullerton Plan, potential hydrology, drainage, or water quality impacts would be reduced with this Alternative. Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would be considered environmental superior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Implementation of The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would result in the expansion or development of facilities that could impact the health and safety of Fullerton residents and employees. Both The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas

Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would provide for a mixed-use land use designation that could potentially allow for mixed-use development in the future, including the placement of residential and non-residential uses in proximity to each other. These non-residential uses may involve the storage and/or use of hazardous materials. Implementation of goals, policies, and actions would minimize risk under both The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative and The Fullerton Plan. However, the existing hazard associated with residential, industrial, or commercial parcels being located within Fullerton Municipal Airport's Runway Protection Zone (Clear Zone) (RPZ) and Accident Potential Zones (APZ) would continue to occur under both The Fullerton Plan and No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative. Therefore, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would allow for new development on existing vacant land. Therefore, potential impacts to known or unknown/undiscovered historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources would be similar under The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative or The Fullerton Plan. However, impacts related to cultural resources associated with either The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would be less than significant by adherence to and/or compliance with the goals, policies, and actions of The Fullerton Plan and mitigation measures. Therefore, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would allow for new development of vacant land within the West Coyote Hills Focus Area, which is known to contain biological resources. Therefore, potential impacts to habit modifications of any species identified as sensitive or special status species, riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, federally protected wetlands, movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species would be similar under The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative or The Fullerton Plan. It is anticipated that impacts related to biological resources associated with either The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative or The Fullerton Plan would be less than significant by adherence to and/or compliance with the current regulatory requirements, the goals, policies, and actions of The Fullerton Plan and mitigation measures. Therefore, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to and The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Similar to The Fullerton Plan, implementation of The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would provide a comprehensive inventory of existing public services and utilities and the levels of service provided to the City. Growth associated with both The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would result in increased demand for public services and utilities beyond existing conditions. Goals, policies, and actions in The Fullerton Plan would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. However, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would allow for the development of fewer residential and

non-residential uses when compared to The Fullerton Plan. This would result in less demand on public services and utilities. Because The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would result in an overall reduced demand for public services and utilities when compared to The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative is considered environmentally superior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

In accordance with AB 32, the City would be required to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Development pursuant to The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would result in additional GHG emissions with future development, similar to The Fullerton Plan. The City has prepared a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to address GHG emissions reduction within the City, which would also be applicable to this Alternative. The strategies identified in the CAP contain emission reduction measures from municipal and non-municipal operations. These measures are consistent with and build upon the goals, policies, and actions within The Fullerton Plan. The strategies identified in the CAP would achieve the desired reduction target of 15 percent below baseline levels by 2020. Therefore, similar to The Fullerton Plan, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would be consistent with the reduction targets of AB 32, resulting in a less than significant impact. Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to The Fullerton Plan in this regard.

CONCLUSION

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would result in similar environmental impacts as The Fullerton Plan for land use, population, employment, and housing, aesthetics, traffic and circulation, air quality, noise, hazards and hazardous materials, cultural resources, biological resources, and greenhouse gas emission. This Alternative would generate fewer impacts than The Fullerton Plan with respect to geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and public services and utilities. It is the intent of The Fullerton Plan to provide new information based on current conditions within the City and to provide goals, policies, and actions that address current conditions. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would provide updated environmental data and goals, policies, and actions that address current and future conditions, similar to The Fullerton Plan. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would provide the vision to achieve the objectives of The Fullerton Plan, which focuses on communicating the “Vision for Fullerton” through a Vision Statement to establish a community-based foundation that captures the City’s qualities, values, and characteristics, now and in the future; updating the Land Use Element (i.e., Community Development and Design Chapter), including the establishment of allowable residential densities and non-residential intensities; creating two new community development types (i.e., Neighborhood Center Mixed-Use and Urban Center Mixed-Use) given the 1996 General Plan land use designations do not encompass the higher end of the density/intensity range now desired for specific areas of the City; establishing guiding principles, derived from the community’s vision for Fullerton; updating General Plan development projections to the year 2030; and communicating “Focus Areas” (i.e., Focus Area Overlay) through a citywide Focus Area Map to more specifically identify those parts of Fullerton where potential change is anticipated or planned. This Alternative would meet the goals of The Fullerton Plan.

8.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that an "Environmentally Superior Alternative" be identified among those considered; that is an alternative that would result in the fewest or least significant environmental impacts. As noted above, the determination of an environmentally superior alternative is based on the consideration of how the alternative fulfills the project objectives and how the alternative either reduces significant, unavoidable impacts or substantially reduces the impacts to the surrounding environment.

NO PROJECT/EXISTING GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE

As it is the intent of The Fullerton Plan to provide new information based on current conditions within the City, the existing General Plan, evaluated under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, would not serve the City as adequately as The Fullerton Plan. Overall, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative and The Fullerton Plan would result in similar environmental impacts, with the exception of impacts related to land use, population, housing, and employment, aesthetics, traffic and circulation, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions, which would generate higher impacts and geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and public services and utilities, which would generate fewer impacts. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not reduce the severity of the significant unavoidable impacts associated with The Fullerton Plan. Thus, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is not selected as the environmentally superior alternative to The Fullerton Plan.

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not meet the vision for the future of the City established by the community to the extent of The Fullerton Plan. The Fullerton Plan provides a community-based foundation that captures the City's qualities, values, and characteristics, now and in the future that would not be supported with the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative. The Fullerton Plan creates two new community development types (i.e., Neighborhood Center Mixed-Use and Urban Center Mixed-Use) in order to encompass the higher end of the density/intensity range now desired for specific areas of the City. Establishing activity centers that will serve the community with improved accessibility would help to improve regional mobility (traffic), reduce vehicle miles traveled, and improve air quality, which would not occur with this Alternative.

Additionally, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not provide the vision for the Focus Areas and policy direction to achieve the objectives of The Fullerton Plan, which focus on communicating the "Vision for Fullerton" through a Vision Statement to establish a community-based foundation that captures the City's qualities, values, and characteristics, now and in the future; updating the Land Use Element (i.e., Community Development and Design Chapter), including the establishment of allowable residential densities and non-residential intensities; creating two new community development types (i.e., Neighborhood Center Mixed-Use and Urban Center Mixed-Use) given the 1996 General Plan land use designations do not encompass the higher end of the density/intensity range now desired for specific areas of the City; establishing guiding principles, derived from the community's vision for Fullerton; updating General Plan development projections to the year 2030; and communicating "Focus Areas" (i.e., Focus Area Overlay) through a citywide Focus Area Map to more specifically identify those

parts of Fullerton where potential change is anticipated or planned. Thus, this Alternative would not meet the goals of The Fullerton Plan. Further this Alternative would not provide updated development projections for the year 2030, nor policy direction that addresses future development and growth anticipated by the City and SCAG.

THE FULLERTON PLAN WITH REDUCED FOCUS AREAS ALTERNATIVE

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would meet the stated objectives of The Fullerton Plan and EIR, as The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would provide new and updated information based on current conditions and would provide updated goals, policies, and actions to direct future growth within the City. Although it would generally meet the growth objectives identified by The Fullerton Plan, this Alternative would provide for less residential and non-residential development. Further, the vision established for the Airport Industrial, North Industrial, and Southeast Industrial Focus Areas would not be achieved.

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would result in similar environmental impacts when compared to The Fullerton Plan with the exception of geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and public services and utilities, which would result in fewer impacts. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would reduce, and potentially eliminate, some of the traffic and circulation impacts associated with intersections within and/or adjacent to the Airport Industrial, North Industrial, and Southeast Industrial Focus Areas, since traffic in these areas would be reduced when compared to The Fullerton Plan. However, it would not completely eliminate the significant unavoidable impacts identified for land use, traffic and circulation, air quality, and noise. However, when compared to The Fullerton Plan, this Alternative would reduce the severity of these significant unavoidable impacts. Although The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative would generally meet the goals and objectives of The Fullerton Plan and would incrementally reduce impacts due to the reduction in growth associated with the Airport Industrial, North Industrial, and Southeast Industrial Focus Areas, it would not accommodate the 2030 growth projections. Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Focus Areas Alternative is not selected as the environmentally superior alternative.

THE FULLERTON PLAN WITH REDUCED GROWTH ALTERNATIVE

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would meet the stated objectives of The Fullerton Plan and EIR, as The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would provide new and updated information based on current conditions and would provide updated goals, policies, and actions to direct future growth within the City. Although it would generally meet the growth objectives identified by The Fullerton Plan, this Alternative would provide for less residential and non-residential development. However, this Alternative would allow for the vision of the Focus Areas to be achieved.

The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would result in similar environmental impacts when compared to The Fullerton Plan with the exception of geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and public services and utilities, which would result in fewer impacts. Although The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would result in an overall reduction in traffic when compared to The Fullerton Plan, the reduction would be

distributed amongst all of the Focus Areas and is not anticipated to eliminate the significant unavoidable traffic impacts identified with The Fullerton Plan. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would incrementally reduce the severity of the significant unavoidable impacts for land use, traffic and circulation, air quality, and noise; however, these significant unavoidable impacts would not be eliminated. The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would meet the goals and objectives of The Fullerton Plan. Although The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative would involve less growth than identified by The Fullerton Plan, it would accommodate the 2030 growth projections to a greater degree when compared to the other alternatives. Further, it would allow for the vision of the Focus Areas to be achieved. Thus, The Fullerton Plan with Reduced Growth Alternative is selected as the environmentally superior alternative.

This page intentionally left blank.