6.0 ALTERNATIVES

This section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") provides a comparative analysis of the environmental effects of alternatives to the proposed Section 31 Specific Plan Project ("Section 31 Specific Plan" or "Project"). This analysis has been prepared in accordance with the guidance provided by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA requires that an environmental impact report (EIR) describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project while avoiding or substantially lessening any of the significant environmental impacts of the project. An EIR must include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed Project. This section identifies and describes alternatives to the proposed Project, evaluates the environmental impacts that would result from each of these alternatives, and compares these with the proposed Project, as required by CEQA.

Key provisions of the State CEQA Guidelines[1] relating to this alternatives analysis are summarized below:

- The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be costlier.
- The No Project Alternative shall be evaluated along with its impact. The No Project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published. Additionally, the analysis shall discuss what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.
- If the project is a development project on an identifiable property, the No Project Alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Discussion of this alternative shall compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state to the environmental effects that would occur if the project were approved. If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this No Project consequence should be discussed. In certain instances, the No Project Alternative means "no build," wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. However, where failure to proceed with the project will not result in preservation of existing environmental conditions, the analysis should identify the practical results of not approving the project rather than create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment.[2]

1 California Code of Regulations, tit. 14, CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6.
2 CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6.

- The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason"; therefore, the EIR must evaluate only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.
- For alternative locations, only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.
- An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.[3]
- The range of feasible alternatives to a proposed project is to be selected and discussed in a manner that fosters meaningful public participation and informed decision-making. Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the applicant could reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site.[4]

A. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The State CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to include a statement of objectives that addresses the underlying purpose of the Project.

As described in **Section 3.0: Project Description**, the City is proposing to adopt the Section 31 Specific Plan for a 618-acre vacant site that would allow the development of a mixed-use community that would include up to 1,932 residential and branded resort units, 400 hotel units, approximately 175,000 square feet of mixed-use core uses, and a Grand Oasis Crystal Lagoon (Grand Oasis lagoon). The proposed master planned community includes resort hotels, a mixed-use town center, residential neighborhoods, a private street system and recreational open space amenities including a swimmable lagoon, an integrated system of pedestrian, bicycle and golf cart trail linkages, neighborhood parks, water features, a community beach club, and complementary features. As shown in **Figure 3.0-3: Conceptual Land Use Plan**, the three land use categories proposed by the Project include the Lagoon (LAG), Mixed-Use Core (M-U CORE), and Residential (RES). Development of the Project would also include four distinct Planning Areas identified as Town Center Planning Area (Town Center), Planning Area 1 (PA 1), Planning Area 2 (PA 2) and Planning Area 3 (PA 3).

3 CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(f)(3).
4 CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(f)(1).

Total buildout of the Project is expected to take approximately 11 years, with construction commencing in 2020 with full development anticipated to be completed by 2030. Implementation of the Project would require the implementation of the following proposed actions:

- Approval of a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change to change the land use designations for the Project Site from Low Density Residential (R-L-2) and Resort Hotel (Rs-H) to Specific Plan with a Mixed Use (M-U) underlay;
- Approval of a General Plan Amendment to reclassify Bob Hope Drive as a Minor Arterial roadway;
- Adoption of the Section 31 Specific Plan;
- Approval of a Development Agreement; and
- Approval of Tentative Tract Maps and Preliminary and Final Development Plans for Project development.

Pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines,[5] the following objectives have been identified for the proposed Project:

- To reflect consistency with the goals and policies of the Rancho Mirage General Plan;
- To create a unique landmark community on one of the last remaining, large, centrally located, vacant parcels in Rancho Mirage, offering a wide range of high-quality innovative housing types varying in density and design;
- To create a 21st-century, sustainable development project that will include extensive use of landscaping that is suitable for the native desert environment and feature responsible uses of natural resources, including opportunities for creative approaches to lighting and energy storage and management consistent with the goals of the Rancho Mirage Energy Authority;
- To design a high-quality, master planned community featuring residential, hotel, mixed-use, and commercial development oriented around a Grand Oasis lagoon offering substantial new public recreational opportunities to extend the tourism season in Rancho Mirage;
- To develop the property in a manner that reduces vehicular traffic and provides linkage of residential neighborhoods to the Grand Oasis lagoon and the Town Center with paseos for walking and biking and other alternative transportation;
- To develop the property in a manner that is compatible with surrounding development, including the Annenberg Estate and Sunnylands Center and Gardens (Sunnylands), by applying appropriate planning, landscaping, and architectural design approaches;

5 CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15124(b).

- To create a vibrant resort and mixed-use development that will generate Transit Occupancy Tax (TOT) and sales tax revenue for the City to support long-term economic stability, while also honoring the legacy and history of the area;
- To create cohesive, central theming for common elements and features while also encouraging high-quality, innovative, and creative design; and
- To allow flexibility to respond to changes in commercial, hotel, and residential market demand such that development enabled by the Project can be effectively marketed, funded, and constructed.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

The State CEQA Guidelines[6] requires an EIR to identify any alternatives that were considered by the Lead Agency but were rejected as infeasible and to briefly explain the reasons underlying the Lead Agency's determination. The State CEQA Guidelines states the following:

> *The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the Lead Agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the Lead Agency's determination…Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.*

Several alternatives were initially considered for further evaluation in this EIR based on the potential for each to reduce or eliminate the significant environmental impacts identified for the Project. The following alternatives were considered and rejected from further consideration.

1. Alternative Site

The City initially considered an alternative site for the Project in accordance with CEQA. As the primary objective of the Project is to develop a specific plan for Section 31 that is consistent with the goals and policies of the Rancho Mirage General Plan, planning for development of alternative sites with the mix of residential, mixed-use core, and lagoon land uses proposed would not feasibly meet this basic Project objective.

Furthermore, the development of an alternative site would not avoid the significant air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts identified for the Project that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. Specifically, construction and operation-related emissions would likely occur regardless

6 CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126.6(c).

of the location since build out of the Section 31 Specific Plan would still occur under a similar schedule with the use of similar equipment and similar intensity of land uses, thus resulting in comparable significant and unavoidable air quality and GHG emissions impacts.

Based on the above, an alternative site is not considered feasible as there is no remaining land within the City available to provide for the design of the Section 31 Specific Plan. In addition, an alternative site would not avoid the significant impacts of the Project, nor would such an alternative meet the basic objectives of the Project. Therefore, this alternative has been eliminated from detailed consideration within this Draft EIR.

2. 2018 Proposed Plan

As identified in the Notice of Preparation (NOP), the Project was originally proposed to implement up to 650 hotel/resort units, 2,625 residential units, and 250,000 square feet of nonresidential development, including hotel/resort support facilities and retail commercial uses. Since the release of the NOP in August 2018, the Project has been refined to provide more consistency with the existing uses proposed for the Project Site under the City's General Plan.

Therefore, this alternative was eliminated from detailed consideration within this Draft EIR because it is not consistent with the current objectives for the Section 31 Specific Plan, which were developed based on public outreach, and would also result in a greater intensity of residential and commercial development over a larger portion of the Project Site, which would increase impacts, such as an increase in emissions and vehicle trips associate with an increase in residential and nonresidential uses, rather than decrease the impacts of the Project.

C. ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED IN DETAIL

The following alternatives were selected for evaluation in this EIR:

1. Alternative 1 – No Project/No Development
2. Alternative 2 – Existing City General Plan
3. Alternative 3 – Approved Eagle Specific Plan
4. Alternative 4 – Regent Eagle Specific Plan
5. Alternative 5 – Reduced Intensity Alternative

A more detailed description of each of these alternatives is provided below.

D. EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

A comparison of the impacts of the Project and the alternatives selected for further evaluation is provided in this section for each of the environmental topics addressed in the Draft EIR. This comparison of impacts assumes, for each topic, that the Mitigation Measures identified in this Draft EIR for the Project would also be incorporated into the alternatives.

In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines, the discussion of the environmental effects of the alternatives in an EIR may be less detailed than provided for in the Project but should be sufficiently detailed to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the Project.[7]

1. Alternative 1—No Project/No Development

Alternative Description

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative ("Alternative 1"), the Project Site would remain in its current and existing vacant, undeveloped condition. This status would continue and the existing environmental conditions would be maintained. The Project Site would retain its visual characteristics and the existing visual resources for the surrounding land uses would not be impacted.

None of the impacts associated with construction and operational activities would occur if Alternative 1 was selected. No construction and operations related air quality emission impacts would occur. Further, none of the significant unavoidable impacts related to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions would occur.

Comparative Impact Evaluation

Aesthetics

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing visual character of the Project Site, which is currently undeveloped, would remain unchanged. The existing visual characteristics and quality of the surrounding Project Site would also remain unchanged under this Alternative. As the change in the visual character of the Project Site and the surrounding area that would result from the Project was determined to be less than significant with compliance with existing City regulations and Project Design Features, neither this Alternative nor the Project would result in significant impacts. However, as no changes to existing conditions to the site would occur and the visual appearance of the site would remain as it is today, no

7 California Code of Regulations, tit. 14, CEQA Guidelines sec. 15126.6(d).

impacts relative to aesthetic impacts would occur under this Alternative. Since no impacts would occur under this Alternative, impacts would be reduced compared to those of the Project.

Air Quality

Under Alternative 1, no construction activities or construction-related vehicle trips would occur; and the short-term emissions related to construction activities would be avoided. Since the Project would not be built on the Project Site, the emissions generated by construction and operation of the Project would also be avoided. The significant unavoidable impacts related to construction emissions for NOx, and operational emissions for VOC, NOx, and CO, would be avoided. As discussed in **Section 5.2: Air Quality**, these impacts are predominantly the result of architectural coating of all buildings and mobile source (vehicle trip) emissions from visitors to the non-residential land uses. This Alternative would result in less air quality impacts when compared to the Project, as it would avoid the addition of any construction and operational emissions.

Biological Resources

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing biological character of the Project Site would remain unchanged. The Project Site is currently vacant and undeveloped and predominantly consists of Sonoran creosote bush scrub. The Project Site provides some habitat suitable for foraging and nesting special-status wildlife species, specifically the burrowing owl, loggerhead shrike, Costa's hummingbird, and black-tailed gnatcatcher. Additionally, the Project Site has a moderate or higher potential to support the Coachella giant sand treader cricket, Palm Springs pocket mouse, flat-tailed horned lizard, Coachella Valley fringe-toed lizard, and Coachella Valley round-tailed ground squirrel.

As Alternative 1 would not involve development of the Project Site, impacts associated with potential disturbance to biological resources would be avoided under this Alternative. While impacts would be less than significant under the Project with mitigation, impacts under Alternative 1 would be reduced when compared to those of the Project.

Cultural Resources

Under this Alternative, the Project Site would remain in its current condition. The Project involves grading of the Project Site that has the potential to disturb any subsurface cultural resources (historic or prehistoric) that might be present on the Project Site.

This Alternative does not involve any disturbance of subsurface soils and the potential disturbance to cultural resources would be avoided. Since this Alternative would not result in any possible impacts on cultural resources, impacts would be reduced when compared to those of the Project.

Energy

Under Alternative 1, short-term energy consumption related to construction activities would be avoided. Since the Project would not be built on the Project Site, energy consumption from operation of the Project would also be avoided. As the Project would be built and operated in a manner determined to be consistent with federal, State, and local regulations, energy conservation and infrastructure were determined to be less than significant and therefore would not cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction or operation. However, energy impacts under this Alternative would be reduced when compared to those under the Project.

Geology and Soils

Alternative 1 would allow the Project Site to remain in its current condition, and no grading or development would occur. The potential for impacts related to loss of topsoil, sedimentation, erosion and landform alterations associated with construction of the Project were determined to be less than significant for the Project as proposed with the incorporation of the identified Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures.

Alternative 1 would not result in construction of the Project Site, the temporary impacts associated with construction of the Project would be avoided under this Alternative. Impacts to geology and soils would be reduced when compared to those of the Project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

No construction activities or construction related vehicle trips would occur with this Alternative, and accordingly greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) related to temporary construction activities would be avoided. As the Project would not be built or operated, GHGs from operation of the Project would also be avoided. The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts due to exceeding the SCAQMD-recommended screening threshold of GHG emissions per service population even with implementation of Mitigation Measures. As Alternative 1 would not result in significant impacts related to GHGs, impacts would be reduced when compared to those of the Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative 1 would not introduce any potentially new hazardous materials related to the Project's construction or operational activities. There would be no uses on-site that would potentially create a hazardous risk to the public or environment or any activities that would inhibit any established hazard evacuation plan. Although the Project would incorporate Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures to ensure that impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials during Project operation would be less than significant, impacts under this Alternative would not occur and thus would be less than the

Project. Since the Alternative would not include the Grand Oasis lagoon, Alternative 1 would not result in impacts related to its operation. While the Project would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation, impacts under Alternative 1 would be reduced when compared to those under the Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this Alternative, the Project Site would remain in its current condition, and no grading or development would occur. Existing stormwater flows across the Project Site would continue to occur and the existing hydrologic and drainage patterns would remain unchanged. Hydrology and water quality impacts during construction of the Project would not occur. Although the Project would implement Mitigation Measures to ensure that impacts associated with hydrology during Project operation would be less than significant, impacts under this Alternative would not occur and thus would be less than the Project. Since Alternative 1 would not result in construction of the Grand Oasis lagoon, the Alternative would not create a risk from a potential seiche condition that may result from seismic activity. While the Project would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation, impacts under Alternative 1 would be reduced when compared to those of the Project.

Land Use and Planning

With the No Project Alternative, there would be no changes in existing land use conditions or in the local or regional land use planning and regulatory frameworks that currently govern the affected land area. Accordingly, there would be no land use impacts. None of the objectives and community benefits of the Project would occur. There would be no development on the Project Site that might improve the City's economic base, nor would the site complement the existing pattern and scale of development across the City. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not implement key General Plan goals and policies, including the City's target to implement a specific plan for the Project Site to ensure the phased, logical, and cost-effective extension of infrastructure and build-out of new development. Nor would this Alternative provide City residents with a mix of functionally integrated land uses to help meet their general social and economic needs as would be enabled by the Project. Consequently, this Alternative would have negative impacts with respect to land use and planning, while the Project would have both positive and less than significant impacts.

This Alternative, like the Project, would not divide an established community and would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Noise

No construction activities would occur with this Alternative, and potential temporary noise impacts from construction would be avoided. As this Alternative would not result in new development, there would be no increase in traffic. Consequently, the only increase in noise levels would be due to an increase in future growth from the general Project Site vicinity. In addition, Alternative 1 would not include the introduction of stationary noise sources such as mechanical equipment, loading docks, or parking lots. Measures have been identified to mitigate all potential noise impacts identified for the Project. Nevertheless, impacts from noise would be less under this Alternative than under the Project.

Population and Housing

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the Project Site would remain vacant and undeveloped. Accordingly, no housing units would be developed and no resultant residential population would be generated. Additionally, no employment opportunities for construction workers or permanent employment opportunities would be generated because no on-site construction activities or development would occur. The Project's impacts with regard to housing and employment would be considered beneficial because it would provide housing supply to help meet the City's housing goals and employment opportunities to construction workers and permanent employment opportunities within the Project Site.

As mentioned, no residential units would be developed on the site under Alternative 1, thus no new residential population would be introduced into the Project Site. Although the Project would have a less than significant impact on population growth, no impacts would occur under this Alternative and, as such, impacts would be less than under the Project.

Public Services

Under this Alternative, development of the Project Site would not occur and no new residents, employees, or visitors would be introduced to the Project area. There would be no increase in demand on local public services, such as fire and emergency services, law enforcement, schools, and libraries and payment of development impact fees to fund these services would not be required. The existing public services that support the local area would remain as is, thus no potential significant impacts on public services would occur under this Alternative. Although the Project would have no significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation on public services, under this Alternative, impacts would be less than those when compared to the Project.

Recreation

The No Project Alternative would not entail any development of the Project Site, thus the addition of new residents, employees, or visitors to the Project Site would not occur. Therefore, there would not be an

increase in demand for park or recreational facilities or services and payment of parkland in-lieu fees, or an equivalent, would not be required. The existing parks and recreation services that support the local area would remain as is, thus no potential significant impacts on parks and recreation facilities would occur under this Alternative. While Alternative 1 would have no impact on parks and recreation facilities, it would not introduce new and unique recreational amenities that would be available to the general public. As such, Alternative 1 would have no impact on recreation but impacts would be greater than those of the Project.

Traffic and Transportation

Under Alternative 1, the Project Site would remain vacant and no development would occur. No short-term (construction) or additional long-term (operational) vehicle trips would be generated on roadways adjacent to the Project Site. Alternative 1 would avoid construction- and operation- related traffic impacts of the Project. Thus, traffic and transportation impacts would be reduced when compared to those of the Project.

Utilities and Service Systems

Water Service and Supply

Under this Alternative, development of the Project Site would not occur. There would be no increase in demand on water supplies. No new demand on local groundwater supplies would occur and this Alternative would result in fewer impacts than those of the Project. Even though neither the Project nor this Alternative would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with this Alternative would be reduced compared to those of the Project.

Wastewater Collection and Treatment

Under this Alternative, development of the Project Site would not occur. There would be no increase in demand on wastewater treatment. This Alternative would result in lesser impacts than those of the Project. Even though neither the Project nor this Alternative would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with this Alternative would be reduced than those of the Project.

Dry Utilities (Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications)

Under this Alternative, development of the Project Site would not occur. Therefore, this would result in an no demand for electricity, natural gas, and communication services and infrastructure. The extension of services the Project Site would not be required. Even though neither the Project nor this Alternative would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with this Alternative would be considered reduced as compared to those of the Project.

Solid Waste

Under this Alternative, no development on the Project Site would occur. As such, no solid waste would be generated under this Alternative. Even though the Project will not have any significant impacts relating to solid waste, impacts under this Alternative would be reduced when compared to the Project.

Summary of Comparative Impacts

A summary comparison of impacts associated with the Project Alternatives is provided in **Table 6.0-12: Comparison of Alternatives to Project**. As described above, the No Project/No Development Alternative would eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with construction- and operation-related air emissions and the Project's generation of GHG emissions. However, impacts related to land use would be greater as the Alternative would not implement the intent of the goals and policies of the City's General Plan. While impacts would be less than significant, impacts in regard to recreation would be greater under Alternative 1 as it would not introduce the Project's public and private recreational amenities. Further, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, population and housing, public services, traffic and transportation, and utilities and service systems.

Relationship to Project Objectives

While potentially significant impacts would be avoided with this Alternative, the following Project objectives would not be achieved with the No Project Alternative:

- To reflect consistency with the goals and policies of the Rancho Mirage General Plan;
- To create a landmark community on one of the last remaining, large, centrally located, vacant parcels in Rancho Mirage, offering a range of housing types varying in density and design;
- To create a 21st-century, sustainable development project that will include use of landscaping that is suitable for the native desert environment and feature responsible uses of natural resources, including opportunities for creative approaches to lighting and energy storage and management consistent with the goals of the Rancho Mirage Energy Authority;
- To design a high-quality, master-planned community featuring residential, hotel, mixed-use, and commercial development oriented around a Grand Oasis lagoon offering substantial new public recreational opportunities to extend the tourism season in Rancho Mirage;
- To develop the Project Site in a manner that reduces vehicular traffic and provides linkage of residential neighborhoods to the Grand Oasis lagoon and the Town Center with paseos for walking and biking and other alternative transportation;

- To develop the Project Site in a manner that is compatible with surrounding development, including the Sunnylands Estate, Center, and Gardens ("Sunnylands"), by applying appropriate planning, landscaping, and architectural design approaches;
- To create a vibrant resort and mixed-use development that will generate Transit Occupancy Tax (TOT) and sales tax revenue for the City to support long-term economic stability, while also honoring the legacy and history of the area;
- To create cohesive, central theming for common elements and features while also encouraging high-quality, innovative, and creative design; and
- To allow flexibility to respond to changes in commercial, hotel, and residential market demand such that development enabled by the Project can be effectively marketed, funded, and constructed.

2. Alternative 2—Existing City General Plan

Alternative Description

The Existing City General Plan Alternative ("Alternative 2") examines the impacts that would result from development of the Project Site with the type and intensity of land uses allowed by the current General Plan zoning designations for the Project Site, as shown on **Figure 4.0-5: City of Rancho Mirage Land Use and Zoning Map,** in **Section 4.0: Environmental Setting** of this Draft EIR. The City's current General Plan zoning designations for the Project Site are designated as Very Low Density Residential (R-L-2) and Resort Hotel Commercial (Rs-H). Based on the maximum permitted residential density of 2 dwelling units/acre, the 443 acres of the Project Site currently designated by the City for R-L-2 uses could accommodate up to 886 dwelling units. This would be a reduction of residential units compared to the Section 31 Specific Plan. Additionally, the existing Rs-H zoning/land use designation can accommodate resorts, hotel rooms, ancillary commercial uses (restaurants, shops, dry cleaners, etc.), condominium hotel units, and condominiums under certain conditions.

Based on a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.25, the 175 acres of the Project Site currently designated by the City for Rs-H uses could accommodate up to approximately 1,905,750 square feet of resort hotel commercial uses. 90 acres of this portion of the Project Site would be dedicated for hotel uses, which would allow for the development of up to 800 hotel rooms and 400 branded residential units. The remaining 85 acres of the Project Site would be dedicated for resort amenities, such as a golf course or open space areas.

Table 6.0-1: Alternative 2 Land Use Summary, presents an estimate of the amount of residential and resort hotel commercial development that would be allowed under Alternative 2**.**

Table 6.0-1
Alternative 2 Land Use Summary

Land Use Category	Acreage	Amount
Very Low Density Residential	433 acres	886 units
Resort Hotel Residential	175 acres	1,905,750 square feet
	90	*800 hotel rooms + 400 branded residential units*
	85	*Golf course/open space amenities*

A total of 886 residential units and approximately 1.9 million square feet of resort hotel development would occur with Alternative 2 as compared to the 1,932 residential units (including 230 branded units), 400 hotel rooms, and approximately 175,000 square feet of commercial uses the proposed Section 31 Specific Plan would allow. As with the Project, Alternative 2 would create a cohesive mixture of residential and resort hotel land uses with the incorporation of open space and recreational uses.

Comparative Impact Evaluation

Aesthetics

Under Alternative 2, the City's General Plan designates the eastern, southern, and western portions of the Project Site generally as Very Low Density Residential (R-L-2), consisting of approximately 443 acres of the Project Site. The northern central portion of the Project Site is designated as Resort Hotel Commercial (Rs-H), consisting of approximately 175 acres. Alternative 2 would develop the residential portion of the Project Site with similar uses as the Project, but at a reduced intensity. Both the Project and this Alternative would develop the majority of the southern and western portions of the Project Site along Bob Hope Drive and Frank Sinatra Drive with residential development, and would develop the resort commercial uses within the northern portion of the site along Gerald Ford Drive. While development under this Alternative would change the existing visual character of the Project Site similar the Project, it would have less of a visual impact.

Under Alternative 2, the Project Site would contain approximately 1,046 fewer residential units and approximately 800 more hotel rooms than the Project. Moreover, buildings under Alternative 2 would be a maximum of 2 stories in height, compared to the Project's maximum of 4 stories within the Town Center. This Alternative would result in the majority of Bob Hope Drive being developed with lower-intensity single-family residential development than the Project, but would develop higher-intensity resort commercial uses on Gerald Ford Drive and Monterey Avenue. Alternative 2 would not require incorporation of the identified Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures as the Project since this Alternative implements the uses adopted by the City's General Plan.

Alternative 2 would result in a similar grading, building, and landscape designs as the Project. As this Alternative would involve a different mix of land uses across the Project Site overall, it would result in a reduced impact to visual character compared to the Project because of the reduced number of residential units and reduction in the height of non-residential buildings.

Air Quality

Construction activities for both Alternative 2 and the Project would produce combustion emissions from various sources, such as on-site heavy-duty construction vehicles, vehicles hauling materials to and from the site, loose dirt from paved site access roadways, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew. Exhaust emissions from construction activities on-site would vary daily as construction activity levels change. Grading activities produce fugitive dust emissions (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) from soil-disturbing activities. It is important to note, grading activities for the entire Project site would remain similar to the Project. As discussed in **Section 5.2: Air Quality**, grading activities would exceed the regional threshold for NOx with mitigation incorporated. However, for purposes of this analysis, the proposed land uses for Alternative 2 were modeled and compared to the Project.

The estimated maximum daily construction emissions based on the proposed land uses for Alternative 2 are provided in **Table 6.0-2: Alternative 2 Maximum Construction Emissions.** As shown, construction activities associated with Alternative 2 would exceed regional concentration thresholds for NOx. Similar to the Project, the analysis assumes implementation of **MM 5.2-1**, that all of the construction equipment activities would occur continuously over the day and that activities would overlap. In addition, based on the recommendation provided by the SCAQMD, implementation of **MM 5.2-2** would require the use of Tier 3 off-road diesel-powered construction equipment equipped with any emissions-control device such as a Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF). The measure would be expected to reduce diesel particulate matter by approximately 85 percent or more. Consequently, overall impacts related to construction would be less than under the Project, however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table 6.0-2
Alternative 2 Maximum Construction Emissions

Source	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
	pounds/day					
Unmitigated	70	120	162	<1	32	9
Mitigated	70	115	162	<1	32	9
SCAQMD threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Note: Refer to the data sheets in ***Appendix B, Alternative 2 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling.***
Mitigated values include compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust and SCAQMD recommended Tier 3 equipment with Level 3 DPF.
Abbreviations: CO = carbon monoxide; NO_X = nitrogen oxide; PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 microns; PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns; ROG = reactive organic gas; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; SO_X = sulfur oxide.

Similar to the Project, operational emissions generated by both stationary and mobile sources would result from normal day-to-day activities associated with the uses that would be permitted by the Project. Source emissions would be generated by the consumption of natural gas and landscape maintenance. Mobile emissions would be generated by the motor vehicles traveling to and from the Project Site. The estimated operational emissions based on the proposed uses for Alternative 2 are shown in **Table 6.0-3: Alternative 2 Maximum Operational Emissions**. As shown, operational emissions would exceed SCAQMD's regional thresholds of significance for VOCs and NOx, but not for CO when compared to the Project. The reason for the reduction in CO emissions is primarily due to the lower amount of vehicles trips under this alternative compared to the Project, a decrease of 8,017 net daily trips. Impacts related to operational emission would be less than those under the Project, however, would not avoid or substantially lessen to a level of less than significant. As such, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table 6.0-3
Alternative 2 Maximum Operational Emissions

Source	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM 2.5
	pounds/day					
Maximum	112	228	366	1	67	21
SCAQMD threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold exceeded?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: Refer to the data sheets in ***Appendix B, Alternative 2 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling.***

Biological Resources

Under Alternative 3, the Project Site would result in similar grading and disturbance activities as those of the Project. Since this Alternative would result in development of the entire Project Site, impacts to biological resources would be similar to those of the Project. There would be comparable impacts to sensitive habitat, sensitive plants, and sensitive wildlife, for which applicable Mitigation Measures would be required to mitigate impacts to a less than significant level. Under this Alternative, similar mitigation would be needed to reduce any potential significant impacts to a less than significant level. Both this Alternative and the Project would result in similar, less than significant impacts with mitigation.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 2 would fully develop the entire Project Site with a mixture of residential and commercial uses, as would the Project. This Alternative would have similar potential to uncover previously unknown historical resources, archeological resources, or human remains. Therefore, there would be comparable impacts to cultural resources, for which applicable Mitigation Measures would be required to mitigate impacts to a less than significant level. The appropriate mitigation before and during construction activities would ensure that development would not result in significant impacts to potential cultural resources. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation. Impacts would be similar to those of the Project.

Energy

Under this Alternative, there would be up to 886 dwelling units, 1,905,750 square feet of resort hotel commercial uses, 800 hotel rooms and 400 branded residential units, and 85 acres dedicated for resort amenities, such as a golf course or open space areas, which would result in an increased demand for electricity, and natural gas consumption for both construction and operation. The Project is considering not only energy measures that meet regulatory compliance of local, State, and federal regulations but would also include additional measures for water and energy conservation, which this alternative would not meet all of these encompassing features. However, this Alternative would be constructed and designed in accordance with the most current version of Title 24, California's Energy Efficiency Standards for buildings and the State Energy Conservation Standards. These standards include minimum energy efficiency requirements related to building envelope, mechanical systems (e.g., HVAC and water heating systems), indoor and outdoor lighting, and illuminated signs. This Alternative would have a reduced fuel consumption due to having fewer vehicle trips compared to the Project. As such, the overall impacts of this alternative would be reduced as compared to the Project due to a decrease energy consumption. Therefore, this alternative would be less than significant as it would continue to follow local, State, and

federal regulatory compliance for energy standards and therefore would not cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction or operation.

Geology and Soils

Alternative 2 would involve comparable construction activities, including grading, for the development of the mixture of residential and commercial uses and would result in similar impacts related to erosion and sedimentation on the Project Site. Any future development within the Project Site occurring would have to comply with the most current California Building Code (CBC) requirements for seismicity, liquefaction, subsidence and expansive soils. Similar to the Project, this Alternative would mitigate potential significant impacts associated with the existing soils and geology conditions of the site. Alternative 2 would be required to develop and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) along with all Project Design Features of the Project and Mitigation Measures pertaining to erosion control plans. For this reason, the geology and soils impacts of this Alternative would be similar to the Project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative 2 would generate GHG emissions from a number of individual sources during both construction and postconstruction (operational) use of the buildings and related activities (e.g., landscape maintenance). Operational activities under Alternative 2 would differ from the Project, as this Alternative would result in an overall decreased amount of development.

As shown in **Table 6.0-4: Alternative 2 Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions,** GHG emissions for Alternative 2 would result in a total of 35,478 MTCO2e annually and 9.8 MTCO2e per service population during buildout. It is important to note, reduction from compliance with local and State standards, as well as applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures, are not reasonably quantifiable in the CalEEMod model and would provide additional emissions reductions not originally accounted. However, the Project would exceed the SCAQMD threshold of 4.1 MTCO2e per service population during buildout. Impacts against the SCAQMD threshold would remain significant and unavoidable.

Similar to the Project, the SCAQMD would allow substitution of Mitigation Measures that include an enforceable commitment to provide mitigation prior to the occurrence of emissions, including **PDF 5.7-1** through **PDF 5.7-3** and **MM 5.7-1** through **5.7-9**. This Alternative would be required to meet the County's emission reductions within the Screening Table. This Alternative would incorporate similar Project Design Features to reduce potential greenhouse gas emission impacts. This Alternative would also be required to comply with the California CalGreen Building Code, the Rancho Mirage Sustainability Plan, and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2016 – 2040 RTP/SCS related to growth forecasts.

As such, impacts related to conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations would be less than significant.

Table 6.0-4
Alternative 2 Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG Emissions Source	Emissions (MTCO2e/year)
Construction (amortized)	1,766
Operational (mobile) sources*	15,066
Area sources	43
Energy	15,306
Waste	943
Water	2,354
Annual Total	**35,478**
Estimated Service Population (Residents and Employees)[a]	3,607
GHG Efficiency MTCO2e/yr/SP	9.8

Source: CalEEMod Emissions calculations are provided in Appendix B, Alternative 2 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling.

Notes: Totals in table may not appear to add exactly due to rounding in the computer model calculations.

Abbreviations: MTCO2e = metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions.

[a] Alternative 2 consists of 1,794 residents and 1,813 employees

**N2O emissions account for 0.32 MTCO2e/year.*

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative 2 would result in grading and excavating activities across the entire Project Site similar to the Project. The temporary transport, storage, handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction of this Alternative would compare to those activities of the Project. As with the Project, the residential and resort commercial uses associated with the operational activities of Alternative 2 would involve the limited use of potentially hazardous materials, which would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable standards and regulations.

The Project Site is not considered to be a hazardous materials site, nor would this Alternative involve any uses that would cause a significant hazard to those occupants on the site, similar to the Project. This Alternative would involve similar road closures during construction, but appropriate Mitigation would substantially reduce potential impacts related to impairment of operations of any emergency response plan. Fire hazards would not be associated with this Alternative, as with the Project, since the Project Site

contains minimal vegetation that could pose any flammable hazards. Alternative 2 would incorporate similar Project Design Features as the Project that would reduce any foreseeable fire hazards on the Project Site. Additionally, since Alternative 2 would not include of the Grand Oasis lagoon, Alternative 2 would not result in impacts related to its operation. Therefore, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, which would be reduced as compared to those of the Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would require the construction of new storm-drain systems, including retention basins used to retain the 100-year flood event. Construction activities under this Alternative would involve temporary surface water runoff and water quality impacts that would be considered to be potentially significant. However, implementation of Project Design Features similar to the Project would minimize surface water runoff from the Project Site and reduce degradation of surface water runoff and water quality, in compliance with the NPDES Program. Development of the Project Site would increase the amount of impervious surfaces resulting in an increase of long-term surface water runoff. This Alternative would incorporate applicable Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features to ensure these impacts remain less than significant. Lastly, as Alternative 2 would not result in construction of the Grand Oasis lagoon, the Alternative would not create a risk from a potential seiche condition that may result from seismic activity. Therefore, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality, which would be reduced to those of the Project.

Land Use and Planning

Implementation of Alternative 2 considers a mixture of residential and resort hotel uses permitted by the City's General Plan land use designations. This Alternative, like the Project, would not divide an established community and would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

A total of 886 residential units, approximately 1,200 resort hotel rooms (800 hotel rooms and 400 branded residential units), and 85 acres of golf course and open space amenities would be developed on the Project Site compared to the Project's 1,932 residential dwelling units, 400 hotel rooms, and 175,000 square feet of commercial space. Accordingly, Alternative 2 would result in approximately 1,046 fewer residential units and approximately 800 more hotel rooms than the Project. As the Alternative would implement the uses permitted by the existing General Plan zoning designations for the Project Site it would result in less than significant impacts, which would be reduced when compared to those of the Project.

Noise

Both Alternative 2 and the Project would include earthmoving activities during construction and would involve the use of heavy equipment, such as air compressors, backhoes, generators, graders, pavers, rollers, and scrapers. Construction under Alternative 2 would differ from the Project, as this Alternative would include 214 fewer single-family residential units, 432 fewer multi-family units, 400 additional hotel rooms, and an 85-acre golf course. Construction equipment sources would cause significant noise impacts to both on- and off-site receptors. Similar to the Project, implementation of applicable Mitigation Measures under this Alternative would reduce construction noise and vibration impacts to a less than significant level.

Operational vehicle trips associated with Alternative 2 would result in 8,017 fewer daily trips when compared to the Project, therefore long-term operational noise generated by traffic under this Alternative would decrease. Impacts related to operational roadway noise would be less than those under the Project, however, impacts would remain less than significant.

Single noise events from parking lots and loading docks could be an annoyance to on-site and surrounding residents during certain time periods such as evening and morning hours and may exceed local standards at receptor locations. Similar to the Project, implementation of Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures would require sound attenuation measures be incorporated into the design of stationary noise sources to minimize noise levels which would reduce potentially significant noise impacts to a less than significant level. Noise impacts under this Alternative from stationary sources would be similar to the Project and impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Population and Housing

Alternative 2 would enable the development of up to 886 residential units and approximately 1,200 hotel rooms (800 hotel rooms and 400 branded residential units) within over 1.9 million square feet designated for Resort Hotel uses. Accordingly, the Project Site would contain approximately 1,046 fewer residential units and approximately 800 more hotel rooms than the Project. At 2.025 persons per household, this Alternative would generate up to 1,795 residents,[8] a decrease of 2,118 residents from the Project. Alternative 2 would generate approximately 1,800 employees related to the resort hotel uses[9] and approximately 13 employees related to the golf course or other recreational amenity,[10] for a combined

8 2.025 persons per household × 886 units = 1,795 residents
9 1.5 employees per hotel room × 1,200 units = 1,800 employees
10 85 acres × 0.15 employee/acre = 13 employees

total of approximately 1,813 employees.[11] This would represent an increase of approximately 775 employees generated when compared to the Project's 1,038 estimated employees.

Similar to the Project, this Alternative would be consistent with City and SCAG population and employment growth projections and policies. However, the reduction in on-site residents would result in a reduced demand on the existing utility infrastructure that services the area when compared to the Project. In addition, Alternative 2 would generate a greater of number of employees compared to the Project, which may draw a substantial number of new residents to fulfill the jobs. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

Public Services

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

Both Alternative 2 and the Project would increase demand on the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) for fire protection and emergency services due to the development of various residential and commercial uses on the Project Site. While there would be an increase in resort hotel intensity under this Alternative, the reduction in residential dwelling units and resultant service population would be anticipated to result in a reduction in the amount of calls for service when compared to the Project. Construction of Alternative 2 would not obstruct emergency access to the site or surrounding areas nor would operational activities impair any response times since the site is located within an area currently serviced by the RCFD. Under this Alternative, all residential and commercial development would comply with the most current adopted fire and building codes and standards and all applicable development impact fees would be paid to the appropriate jurisdiction. Therefore, implementation of this Alternative would not result in the need for new or the physical alternation to any existing governmental facility in regard to fire protection and emergency services, and impacts would be less than significant. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

Law Enforcement Services

Alternative 2, like the Project, would increase demand on the Riverside County Sherriff's Department (Sheriff's Department) for law enforcement services due to the development of various residential and commercial uses on the site. While this Alternative would still create additional calls for service, the reduction in residential dwelling units and resultant reduction in service population under this Alternative

11 County of Riverside Environmental Impact Report No. 521, Public Review Draft, March 2014, Table 4.1-D; open space–recreation employee estimates provided by Pacific Hotels.

when compared with the Project would reduce demand on the Sheriff's Department. Like the Project, this Alternative would also incorporate Project Design Features that would enhance security and access throughout the site to reduce needed service from the Sheriff's Department. However, in order to accommodate the Alternative's increased demand for services, the Sheriff's Department would require additional officers to service the site. Mitigation Measures similar to the Project would require payment of development impact fees to the appropriate jurisdiction to reduce impacts to less than significant. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

School Services

Alternative 2 would increase demand on the Palm Springs Unified School District (PSUSD) for school services due to development of residential units and resort hotel uses and the resultant generation of students. As with the Project, Alternative 2 would fall within the attendance boundaries of PSUSD and would be serviced by the three schools of Rancho Mirage Elementary, Nellie N. Coffman Middle, and Rancho Mirage High. Alternative 2 would result in a reduction in the number of students generated because it would include approximately 1,046 fewer residential units than the Project. Alternative 2 would generate approximately 298 students from the residential uses and approximately 107 students from families of employees associated with the resort hotel uses for a combined total of 405 students; this represents 99 fewer than the 504 students generated by the Project. The three schools that would service Alternative 2 are currently operating below their capacities and the addition of students generated by this Alternative would not cause any of them to operate over their capacities. Meanwhile, the Project would generate approximately 6 students above the operating capacity of Rancho Mirage Elementary. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in reduced impacts than the Project. However, the Project's payment of applicable impact fees would be paid to PSUSD to mitigate these impacts to less than significant levels; Alternative 2 would similarly pay applicable impact fees to mitigate impacts to schools. Even though neither this Alternative nor the Project would result in significant impacts, impacts associated with this Alternative would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

Library Services

Alternative 2, like the Project, would increase demand on the Rancho Mirage Public Library for library services. While this Alternative would create additional demand for library services, the reduction in residential dwelling units and resultant decrease in service population under this Alternative when compared to the Project would therefore result in reduced demand on library services when compared to the Project. The Rancho Mirage Library has indicated that it currently has sufficient capacity to accommodate the growing demands of the City, including the Project. However, similar to the Project, this Alternative would require payment of applicable development impact fees to the appropriate jurisdiction.

Even though neither this Alternative nor the Project would result in significant impacts, impacts associated with this Alternative would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

Recreation

Alternative 2 would implement similar uses on the Project Site, but at a reduced intensity. Thus, Alternative 2 would result in similar demand for parks and recreational facilities due to the increase in residents and visitors on the Project Site when compared to the Project. While Alternative 2 would not include the development of the Grand Oasis lagoon, it would include the 85 acres of the Project Site would be dedicate for resort amenities, such as a golf course or open space areas. Like the Project, implementation of Alternative 2 would provide recreation and open spaces throughout the Project Site available for residents and those visiting the Project Site. However, it is unlikely that the Alternative would contain the same level of recreation as proposed by the Project. On the other hand, this Alternative's reduction in residential and commercial development on the site would involve the ability to integrate more space for recreational opportunities within the Alternative's land use design. This increase in recreational opportunity on the site would help minimize the increased demand on existing City parks and recreational facilities as a result of the increased population generation. Applicable mitigation would be implemented when compared to the Project, which includes payment of parkland fees to minimize recreational impacts. Additionally, these recreational facilities would be constructed concurrently with development of the Alternative and would contribute to overall construction impacts. Overall, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant impacts, similar to those of the Project.

Traffic and Transportation

Under full implementation, the Project would generate 22,764 total net new trips. Alternative 2 would generate 8,017 fewer net new weekday trips than the Project. All intersections were determined to result in a level of service (LOS) D or better with the Project, with the exception of two intersections. All impacts to study intersections associated with the Project would be less than significant with incorporation of applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures, and therefore, impacts associated with Alternative 2 would also be less than significant. Although the Project and Alternative 2 would not have any significant impacts relating to traffic and transportation, impacts under Alternative 2 would be reduced when compared to those of the Project.

Utilities and Service Systems

Water Service and Supply

Alternative 2 would result in a total of 886 residential units and approximately 1.9 million square feet of resort hotel development which would have a corresponding water demand of 1,861.82 acre-feet per year

(afy).[12] The aquifer and other sources of supply are adequate for a single dry year and also multiple dry years for a 20-year period. Like the Project, this Alternative would require additional water infrastructure to serve the Project Site. The water demand associated with this Alternative would result in an increase of 331.16 afy when compared to the Project's water demand of 1,530.66 afy. Alternative 2 would result in increased impacts to water service when compared to the Project and unlike the Project, would exceed CVWD's Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA). Impacts associated with the Project would be less than significant with incorporation of applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures, and therefore impacts associated with Alternative 2 water demand would also be less than significant. Even though Alternative 2 would result in less than significant impacts to water demand, Alternative 2 would exceed CVWD's MAWA and could result in a potentially significant impact. Impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be greater than those of the Project.

Wastewater Collection and Treatment

Alternative 2 would have a total of 890 residential units, 800 hotel rooms, and 400 branded residential units. The remaining 85 acres of the Project Site would be dedicated for resort amenities, such as a golf course or open space areas. The Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD) uses a peak flow factor of 200 gallons per day per equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) to determine wastewater generation. Based on the number of EDUs for this Alternative (890 residential EDUs and 1,200 commercial EDU), this Alternative would generate 0.42 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater, approximately 0.84 mgd fewer than the Project. Similar to the Project, wastewater generated by this Alternative would be treated at the water reclamation plant (WRP) No. 10. Accordingly, available treatment capacity would be provided and impacts would be less than significant under this Alternative with incorporation of applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be reduced compared to those of the Project.

Dry Utilities (Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications)

Alternative 2 would reduce the number of residential units but increase the amount of resort hotel land use as compared to the Project, but would continue to develop the whole Project Site and thus would require the same extension of infrastructure. Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would require submittal, review, and approval of plans through the City and relevant utility providers, which would ensure future utility demands would be manageable. Any further need for infrastructure upgrades associated with Alternative 2 would be accomplished through the required design review and approval of electricity,

12 Residential units = 929.64 acre-feet per year (afy); Hotel Rooms = 293.93 afy; Open Space = 294.20 afy; Commercial Uses = 344.05 afy.

natural gas, and telecommunication plans for Alternative 2 through the City and the appropriate regulatory agencies and utility providers. Even though neither the Project nor this Alternative would result in any potentially significant impact, impacts associated with this Alternative would be reduced when compared to those of the Project. Impacts under this Alternative related to electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications infrastructure would be similar to the Project and impacts would remain less than significant.

Solid Waste

Alternative 2 would have a total of 886 residential dwelling units and over 1.9 million square feet of commercial development. **Table 6.0-5: Solid Waste Generation of Alternative 2**, indicates that this Alternative would generate 4,932.3 tons per year, which is 3,264.2 more tons per year fewer than the Project. In comparison to the Project's approximate 4.5 tons of solid waste per day, Alternative 2 would contribute 9 additional tons of solid waste per day.

Table 6.0-5
Solid Waste Generation of Alternative 2

Building Type	Units	Rate	Solid Waste (tons/year)
Residential	886 du	0.41 tons per du	363.3
Commercial	1,903,750 sq. ft.	2.4 tons per 1,000 sq. ft.	4,569
Total			**4,932.3**

Source: County of Riverside Environmental Impact Report No. 521, Public Review Draft, March 2014, Table 4.17-N.
Abbreviations: du = dwelling units; sq. ft. = square feet
Note: The solid waste generation rates do not take into account required solid waste reductions.

There is adequate capacity and expansion potential within the regional landfill system to accommodate the solid waste expected to be generated by this Alternative or the Project. Closure dates of landfills for the existing landfills are estimates and subject to change depending on the actual tonnage that is received prior to their estimated closing date. While this Alternative and the Project would increase demand for waste disposal services, incorporation of similar mitigation would reduce impacts related to solid waste for both to less than significant levels. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be comparatively greater than the Project.

Summary of Comparative Impacts

Alternative 2 would result in incrementally reduced impacts when compared to the Project with respect to aesthetics, air quality, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, population and housing, public services, traffic and transportation, and wastewater

collection and treatment. Impacts related to Alternative 2 would be similar to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, noise, recreation, and dry utilities. Alternative 2 would result in greater impacts when compared to the Project on water service and supply and solid waste. No significant impacts would be avoided or substantially reduced to a level of less than significant with respect to air quality or GHG emissions.

Relationship to Project Objectives

With the implementation of the City's General Plan, Alternative 2 would develop the Project Site consistent with the type and intensity of land uses allowed by the City General Plan land use zoning designations for the Project Site when compared to the Project. While Alternative 2 would implement a high-quality landmark master-planned community on Section 31, one of the last remaining, large, centrally located, vacant parcels in the City, Alternative 2 would not include the Grand Oasis lagoon, which serves as a primary feature of the Project. No significant impacts would be avoided with this Alternative. While recreational features would be provided as part of Alternative 2, these features would not offer a new unique public recreational opportunity that would extend the tourism season within the City. Furthermore, the following Project objectives would not be achieved with this Alternative:

- To design a high-quality, master-planned community featuring residential, hotel, mixed-use, and commercial development oriented around a Grand Oasis Crystal lagoon offering substantial new public recreational opportunities to extend the tourism season in Rancho Mirage;
- To develop the Project Site in a manner that reduces vehicular traffic and provides linkage of residential neighborhoods to the Grand Oasis lagoon and the Town Center with paseos for walking and biking and other alternative transportation;
- To create cohesive, central theming for common elements and features while also encouraging high-quality, innovative, and creative design; and
- To allow flexibility to respond to changes in commercial, hotel, and residential market demand such that development enabled by the Project can be effectively marketed, funded, and constructed.

The following Project objectives would be partially met:

- To reflect consistency with the goals and policies of the Rancho Mirage General Plan;
- To create a landmark community on one of the last remaining, large, centrally located, vacant parcels in Rancho Mirage, offering a range of housing types varying in density and design;
- To create a 21st-century, sustainable development project that will include use of landscaping that is suitable for the native desert environment and feature responsible uses of natural resources, including opportunities for creative approaches to lighting and energy storage and management consistent with the goals of the Rancho Mirage Energy Authority; and

- To develop the Project Site in a manner that is compatible with surrounding development, including the Sunnylands Estate, Center, and Gardens (Sunnylands), by applying appropriate planning, landscaping, and architectural design approaches.

In addition, this Alternative would have the potential to generate additional Transit Occupancy Tax (TOT) and sales tax revenue for the City. However, without the unique feature of the Grand Oasis lagoon, it is doubtful that 800 hotel rooms would be economically feasible.

3. Alternative 3—Approved Eagle Specific Plan

Alternative Description

The Approved Eagle Specific Plan Alternative ("Alternative 3") examines the impacts that would result from development of the Project Site with the type and intensity of land uses allowed by the Eagle Specific Plan. In 1993, the City previously adopted The Eagle Specific Plan for the Project Site. The Eagle Specific Plan proposed a 36-hole golf course community, including associated residential and open space/recreational uses within the Project Site. However, The Eagle plans for development never came to fruition with the City's 2005 General Plan update, which required a portion of the site to be developed with Resort Hotel (Rs-H) uses.

Under Alternative 3, approximately 277 acres of the Project Site would be dedicated for residential uses, allowing for up to 1,240 residential units. The remaining 341 acres of the Project Site would be dedicated for open space uses, which includes a 36-hole golf course.

Table 6.0-6: Alternative 3 Land Use Summary, presents an estimate of the amount of residential and open space land uses that are proposed under Alternative 3**.**

A total of 1,240 residential units and approximately 341 acres of open space would be developed under Alternative 3 as compared to the 1,932 residential units, 400 hotel units, 230 branded resort units, and approximately 175,000 square feet of mixed-use core uses the proposed Section 31 Specific Plan would allow. Alternative 3 would not include the development of resort hotel land uses in comparison to the Project.

Table 6.0-6
Alternative 3 Land Use Summary

Land Use Category	Acreage	Amount
Residential	277 acres	1,240 units
Open Space	341 acres[a]	–

[a] The open space land use category is assumed to accommodate a 36-hole golf course.

Comparative Impact Evaluation

Aesthetics

Under Alternative 3, the site would be developed with only single-family residential uses and a 36-hole golf course. There would be a reduced intensity of uses, with 692 less residential units on the Project Site. This Alternative would change the visual nature of the Project Site, as would the Project, but the aesthetic changes would be of less intensity and would contain more open space associated with the 341-acres dedicated for the golf course. Thus, surrounding views of distant mountains would be less obstructed under Alternative 3. As the entire 618-acre site would still be fully developed, the visual character impacts of this Alternative would be similar to the Project, but to a lesser degree. In addition, Alternative 4 would incorporate applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures to reduce impacts to the visual character of the Project Site. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts, reduced as compared to those of the Project.

Air Quality

Construction activities for both Alternative 3 and the Project would produce combustion emissions from various sources, such as on-site heavy-duty construction vehicles, vehicles hauling materials to and from the site, loose dirt from paved site access roadways, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew. Exhaust emissions from construction activities on-site would vary daily as construction activity levels change. Grading activities produce fugitive dust emissions (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) from soil-disturbing activities. It is important to note, grading activities for the entire Project site would remain similar to the Project. As discussed in **Section 5.2: Air Quality**, grading activities would exceed the regional threshold for NOx with mitigation incorporated. However, for purposes of this analysis, the proposed land uses for Alternative 3 were modeled and compared to the Project.

The estimated maximum daily construction emissions based on the proposed land uses for Alternative 3 are provided in **Table 6.0-7: Alternative 3 Maximum Construction Emissions.** As shown, construction activities associated with Alternative 3 would not exceed regional concentration thresholds. Although emissions under this alternative would be below regional concentration thresholds, implementation of **MM 5.2-1** and **5.2-2** would further reduce emissions from construction. These measures would be expected to reduce diesel particulate matter by approximately 85 percent or more. Therefore, overall impacts related to construction would be less than under the Project, and would be less than significant.

Table 6.0-7
Alternative 3 Maximum Construction Emissions

Source	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
	pounds/day					
Unmitigated	43	34	50	<1	6	2
Mitigated	41	36	52	<1	6	2
SCAQMD threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Note: Refer to the data sheets in ***Appendix B, Alternative 3 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling.***
Mitigated values include compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust and SCAQMD recommended Tier 3 equipment with Level 3 DPF.
Abbreviations: CO = carbon monoxide; NO_X = nitrogen oxide; PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 microns; PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns; ROG = reactive organic gas; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; SO_X = sulfur oxide.

Similar to the Project, operational emissions generated by both stationary and mobile sources would result from normal day-to-day activities associated with the uses that would be permitted by the Project. Source emissions would be generated by the consumption of natural gas and landscape maintenance. Mobile emissions would be generated by the motor vehicles traveling to and from the Project Site. The estimated operational emissions based on the proposed uses for Alternative 3 are shown in **Table 6.0-8: Alternative 3 Maximum Operational Emissions**. As shown, operational emissions would exceed SCAQMD's regional thresholds of significance for VOCs and NOx, but not for CO when compared to the Project. The reason for the reduction in CO emissions is primarily due to the lower amount of vehicles trips under this alternative compared to the Project, a decrease of 10,905 net daily trips. Impacts related to operational emission would be less than those under the Project, however, would not avoid or substantially lessen to a level of less than significant. As such, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table 6.0-8
Alternative 3 Maximum Operational Emissions

Source	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM 2.5
	pounds/day					
Maximum	84	193	341	1	66	19
SCAQMD threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold exceeded?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: Refer to the data sheets in ***Appendix B, Alternative 3 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling.***

Biological Resources

Under Alternative 3, the Project Site would result in similar grading and disturbance activities as those of the Project. Since this Alternative would result in development of the entire Project Site, impacts to biological resources would be similar to those of the Project. There would be comparable impacts to sensitive habitat, sensitive plants, and sensitive wildlife, for which applicable Mitigation Measures would be required to mitigate impacts to a less than significant level. Under this Alternative, similar mitigation would be needed to reduce any potential significant impacts to a less than significant level. Both this Alternative and the Project would result in similar, less than significant impacts with mitigation.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 3 would fully develop the entire Project Site with a mixture of residential and commercial uses, as would the Project. This Alternative would have similar potential to uncover previously unknown historical resources, archeological resources, or human remains. Therefore, there would be comparable impacts to cultural resources, for which applicable Mitigation Measures would be required to mitigate impacts to a less than significant level. The appropriate mitigation before and during construction activities would ensure that development would not result in significant impacts to potential cultural resources. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less than significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation. Impacts would be similar to those of the Project.

Energy

Under this alternative, there would be up to 1,240 residential units and approximately 341 acres dedicated for open space uses, which would result in an increased demand for electricity, and natural gas consumption for both construction and operation. The Project is considering not only energy measures that meet regulatory compliance of local, State, and federal regulations but would also include additional measures for water and energy conservation, which this alternative would not meet all of these encompassing features. However, this alternative would be constructed and designed in accordance with the most current version of Title 24, California's Energy Efficiency Standards for buildings and the State Energy Conservation Standards. These standards include minimum energy efficiency requirements related to building envelope, mechanical systems (e.g., HVAC and water heating systems), indoor and outdoor lighting, and illuminated signs. This alternative would have a reduced fuel consumption due to having fewer vehicle trips compared to the Project. As such, the overall impacts of this alternative would be reduced as compared to the Project due to a decrease in energy consumption. Therefore, this alternative would be less than significant as it would continue to follow local, State, and federal regulatory compliance for energy standards and therefore would not cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction or operation.

Geology and Soils

Alternative 3 would involve comparable construction activities, including grading, for the development of the mixture of residential and commercial uses and would result in similar impacts related to erosion and sedimentation on the Project Site. This Alternative would result in similar impacts related to erosion and sedimentation on the Project Site. Any future development within the Project Site would have to comply with the most current CBC requirements for seismicity, liquefaction, subsidence, and expansive soils, similar to the Project, which would mitigate potential significant impacts associated with the existing soils and geology conditions of the site. Alternative 3 would be required to develop and implement a SWPPP along with all Project Design Features of the Project and Mitigation Measures pertaining to erosion control plans. For this reason, the geology and soils impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant, but would be reduced compared to the Project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative 3 would generate GHG emissions from a number of individual sources during both construction and postconstruction (operational) use of the buildings and related activities (e.g., landscape maintenance). Operational activities under Alternative 3 would differ from the Project, as this Alternative would result in an overall decreased amount of development.

As shown in **Table 6.0-9: Alternative 3 Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions,** GHG emissions for Alternative 3 would result in a total of 23,528 MTCO2e annually and 9.2 MTCO2e per service population during buildout. It is important to note, reduction from compliance with local and state standards, as well as applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures, are not reasonably quantifiable in the CalEEMod model and would provide additional emissions reductions not originally accounted. However, the Project would exceed the SCAQMD threshold of 4.1 MTCO2e per service population during build out. Impacts against the SCAQMD threshold would remain significant and unavoidable. Overall, however, Alternative 3 would generate fewer total GHG emissions than the Project.

Similar to the Project, the SCAQMD would allow substitution of Mitigation Measures that include an enforceable commitment to provide mitigation prior to the occurrence of emissions, including **PDF 5.7-1** through **PDF 5.7-3** and **MM 5.7-1** through **5.7-9**. This Alternative would be required to meet the County's emission reductions within the Screening Table. This Alternative would incorporate similar Project Design Features to reduce potential greenhouse gas emission impacts. This Alternative would also be required to comply with the California CalGreen Building Code, the Rancho Mirage Sustainability Plan, and the SCAG 2016 – 2040 RTP/SCS related to growth forecasts. As such, impacts related to conflicting with applicable plans, policies, or regulations would be less than significant.

Table 6.0-9
Alternative 3 Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG Emissions Source	Emissions (MTCO2e/year)
Construction (amortized)	463
Operational (mobile) sources*	14,537
Area sources	42
Energy	5,493
Waste	828
Water	2,165
Annual Total	**23,528**
Estimated Service Population (Residents and Employees)[a]	2,562
GHG Efficiency MTCO2e/yr/SP	9.2

Source: CalEEMod Emissions calculations are provided in Appendix B, Alternative 3 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling.

Notes: Totals in table may not appear to add exactly due to rounding in the computer model calculations.

Abbreviations: MTCO2e = metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions.

[a] Alternative 3 consists of 2,511 residents and 51 employees.

**N2O emissions account for 0.12 MTCO2e/year.*

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative 3 would result in grading and excavating activities across the entire Project Site similar to the Project. The temporary transport, storage, handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction of this Alternative would be comparable to those activities of the Project. While this Alternative involves a greater portion of the Project Site dedicated to open space uses than residential and resort commercial uses, and thus a reduction of residents inhabiting the site, people would still be exposed to potential hazards. The residential uses associated with the operational activities of Alternative 3 would involve the limited use of potentially hazardous materials. There would still be use of hazardous materials associated with the residential uses and 36-hole golf course, such as use of pesticides, paints, household cleaners, and landscaping products. The use, storage, and disposal of these hazardous materials would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable standards and regulations. Additionally, since Alternative 3 would not include of the Grand Oasis lagoon, Alternative 3 would not result in impacts related to its operation.

The Project Site is not considered to be a hazardous materials site, nor would this Alternative involve any uses that would cause a significant hazard to those occupants on the site, similar to the Project. This

Alternative would involve similar road closures during construction, but appropriate Mitigation would substantially reduce potential impacts related to impairment of operations of any emergency response plan. Fire hazards would not be associated with this Alternative, as with the Project, since the Project Site contains minimal vegetation that could pose any flammable hazards. Alternative 3 would incorporate similar Project Design Features as the Project that would reduce any foreseeable fire hazards on the Project Site. Additionally, since Alternative 3 would not include of the Grand Oasis lagoon, Alternative 2 would not result in impacts related to its operation. Therefore, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, which would be reduced as compared to those of the Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would require the construction of new storm-drain systems, including retention basins used to retain the 100-year flood event. Construction activities under this Alternative would involve temporary surface water runoff and water quality impacts that would be considered to be potentially significant. However, implementation of Project Design Features, similar to the Project, would minimize surface water runoff from the Project Site and reduce degradation of surface water runoff and water quality, in compliance with the NPDES Program. Development of the Project Site would increase the amount of impervious surfaces resulting in an increase of long-term surface water runoff. This Alternative would incorporate Project Design Features, similar to the Project, to ensure these impacts remain less than significant. Lastly, as Alternative 3 would not result in construction of the Grand Oasis lagoon, the Alternative would not create a risk from a potential seiche condition that may result from seismic activity. Therefore, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality, which would be reduced as compared to those of the Project.

Land Use and Planning

Implementation of Alternative 3 would develop the Project Site with a mixture of residential and open space/recreational uses permitted by the previously-approved Eagle Specific Plan. A total of 1,240 residential units and approximately 341 acres of open space, anticipated to include a 36-hole golf course, would be developed on the Project Site. This is compared to the Project's 1,932 residential dwelling units, 400 resort/hotel rooms, and 175,000 square feet of commercial space, as well as approximately 95 acres of open space (in addition to the 34-acre Grand Oasis lagoon) distributed throughout the site. Alternative 3 would result in an approximately 36 percent reduction in residential units and approximately 246 acres more of open space than the Project.

Alternative 3 would not be considered to be in substantial conformance with the City's current General Plan land use designation for the Project Site, which designates the site for residential and Resort Hotel

(Rs-H) uses, and thus would not generate TOT revenue for the City. This would be considered a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation. In addition, this Alternative would not provide City residents with a mix of functionally integrated land uses to help meet their general social and economic needs as would be enabled by the Project. Consequently, this Alternative would have negative impacts with respect to land use and planning, while the Project would have both positive and less than significant impacts.

Noise

Both Alternative 3 and the Project would include earthmoving activities during construction and would involve the use of heavy equipment, such as air compressors, backhoes, generators, graders, pavers, rollers, and scrapers. Construction under Alternative 3 would differ from the Project, as this Alternative would include 140 additional single-family residential units and a 36-acre golf course. This Alternative would not include the hotel (net reduction of 400 rooms), multi-family residential units (net reduction of 832 units) and retail uses (net reduction of 175,000 square feet) when compared to the Project. Construction equipment sources would cause significant noise impacts to both on- and off-site receptors. Implementation of **MM 5.11-1** under this Alternative would reduce construction noise and vibration impacts to a less than significant level.

Operational vehicle trips associated with Alternative 3 would result in 10,905 fewer daily trips when compared to the Project, therefore, long-term operational noise generated by traffic under this Alternative would decrease. Impacts related to operational roadway noise would be less than those under the Project, however, impacts would remain less than significant.

Single noise events from parking lots and loading docks could be an annoyance to on-site and surrounding residents during certain time periods such as evening and morning hours and may exceed local standards at receptor locations. Similar to the Project, implementation of applicable Project Design and Mitigation Measures) would require sound attenuation measures be incorporated into the design of stationary noise sources to minimize noise levels which would reduce potentially significant noise impacts to a less than significant level. Impacts under this Alternative to stationary sources would be similar to the Project and impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Population and Housing

Under Alternative 3, the site would contain approximately 692 fewer residential units and approximately 246 acres more of open space than the Project, including a 36-hole golf course. This Alternative would

result in 2,511 residents,[13] which is 1,402 fewer residents than the Project. Additionally, this Alternative would generate approximately 51 employees[14] related to the golf course land use,[15] a decrease of approximately 987 employees compared to the Project's 1,038 estimated employees.

Similar to the Project, this Alternative would be consistent with City and SCAG population and employment growth projections and policies. However, the reduction in on-site residents would result in a reduced demand on the existing utility infrastructure that services the area when compared to the Project. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 3 would be less than the Project.

Public Services

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

Both Alternative 3 and the Project would increase demand on RCFD for fire protection and emergency services due to the development of residential and open space/recreation uses on the Project Site. The reduction of 692 residential dwelling units and resultant service population associated with Alternative 3 would be anticipated to result in a reduction in the amount of calls for service when compared to the Project. Construction of Alternative 3 would not obstruct emergency access to the site or surrounding areas nor would operational activities impair any response times since the site is located within an area currently serviced by the RCFD. Under this Alternative, all development would comply with the most current adopted fire and building codes and standards and all applicable development impact fees would be paid to the appropriate jurisdiction. Therefore, implementation of this Alternative would not result in the need for new or the physical alternation to any existing governmental facility in regard to fire protection and emergency services, and impacts would be less than significant. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

Law Enforcement Services

Alternative 3, like the Project, would increase demand on the Sheriff's Department for law enforcement services due to the development of residential and open space/commercial uses on the site. While this Alternative would still create additional calls for service, the reduction in residential dwelling units and resultant reduction in service population under this Alternative when compared with the Project would reduce demand on the Sheriff's Department. Like the Project, this Alternative would also incorporate

13 2.025 persons per household × 1,240 units = 2,511 residents.
14 341 acres × 0.15 employee/acre = 51 employees.
15 County of Riverside Environmental Impact Report No. 521, Public Review Draft, March 2014, Table 4.1-D; open space–recreation employee estimates provided by Pacific Hotels.

Project Design Features that would enhance security and access throughout the site to reduce needed service from the Sheriff's Department. However, in order to accommodate the Alternative's increased demand for services, the Sheriff's Department would require additional officers to service the site. Mitigation Measures similar to the Project would require payment of development impact fees to the appropriate jurisdiction to reduce impacts to less than significant. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 3 would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

School Services

Alternative 3 would increase demand on PSUSD for school services due to development of residential units and the resultant generation of students. As with the Project, Alternative 3 would fall within the attendance boundaries of PSUSD and would be serviced by the three schools of Rancho Mirage Elementary, Nellie N. Coffman Middle, and Rancho Mirage High. Alternative 3 would result in a reduction in the number of students generated because it would include approximately 1,402 fewer residential units than the Project. Alternative 3 would generate approximately 416 students from the residential uses; this represents 88 fewer than the 504 students generated by the Project. The three schools that would service Alternative 3 are currently operating below their capacities and the addition of students generated by this Alternative would not cause any of them to operate over their capacities. Meanwhile, the Project would generate approximately 6 students above the operating capacity of Rancho Mirage Elementary. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in reduced impacts than the Project. However, the Project's payment of applicable impact fees would be paid to PSUSD to mitigate these impacts to less than significant levels; Alternative 3 would similarly pay applicable impact fees to mitigate impacts to schools. Even though neither this Alternative nor the Project would result in significant impacts, impacts associated with this Alternative would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

Library Services

Alternative 3, like the Project, would increase demand on the Rancho Mirage Public Library for library services. While this Alternative would create additional demand for library services, the reduction in residential dwelling units and resultant decrease in service population under this Alternative when compared to the Project would therefore result in reduced demand on library services when compared to the Project. The Rancho Mirage Library has indicated that it currently has sufficient capacity to accommodate the growing demands of the City, including the Project. However, similar to the Project, this Alternative would require payment of applicable development impact fees. Even though neither this Alternative nor the Project would result in significant impacts, impacts associated with this Alternative would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

Recreation

Alternative 3 would result in a reduction of residential units compared to the Project. As such, the reduced number of residential units in this Alternative would create a reduced demand on the City's existing parks and recreational facilities when compared to the Project. While Alternative 3 would not include the development of the Grand Oasis lagoon, it would include a 36-hole golf course. Like the Project, implementation of Alternative 3 would provide recreation and open spaces throughout the Project Site available for residents and those visiting the Project Site. However, it is unlikely that the Alternative would contain the same level of recreation as proposed by the Project due to the reduction of available recreation and open space amenities. On the other hand, this Alternative's reduction in residential and commercial development on the site would involve the ability to integrate more space for recreational opportunities within the Alternative's land use design. This increase in recreational opportunity on the site would help minimize the increased demand on existing City parks and recreational facilities as a result of the increased population generation. Applicable mitigation would be implemented when compared to the Project, which includes payment of parkland fees to minimize recreational impacts. Additionally, these recreational facilities would be constructed concurrently with development of the Alternative and would contribute to overall construction impacts. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in less than significant impacts, similar to those of the Project.

Traffic and Transportation

Implementation of this Alternative would allow for up to 1,240 residential units and 341 acres of dedicated for open space uses, which is assumed for the purposes of this analysis to include a 36-hole golf course. Alternative 3 would generate 10,905 fewer net new weekday trips than the Project. All impacts to study intersections associated with the Project would be less than significant with incorporation of applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures, and therefore, impacts associated with Alternative 3 would also be less than significant. Although the Project and Alternative 3 would not have any significant impacts relating to traffic and transportation, impacts under Alternative 3 would be reduced when compared to those of the Project.

Utilities and Service Systems

Water Service and Supply

Alternative 3 would allow for up to 1,240 residential units and 341 acres of dedicated for open space uses, which is assumed for the purposes of this analysis to include a 36-hole golf course. The water demand associated with this Alternative would be approximately 1,784.08 afy.[16] The aquifer and other sources of

16 Residential units = 728.08 acre-feet per year (afy); Open Space = 1,056.00 afy.

supply are adequate for a single dry year and also multiple dry years for a 20-year period. Like the Project, this Alternative would require additional water infrastructure to serve the site. The water demand associated with this Alternative would result in an increase of 253.42 afy when compared to the Project's water demand of 1,530.66 afy. Alternative 3 would result in increased impacts to water service when compared to the Project and unlike the Project, would exceed CVWD's MAWA. Impacts associated with the Project would be less than significant with incorporation of applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures. Alternative 3 would exceed CVWD's MAWA and could result in a potentially significant impact. Impacts associated with Alternative 3 would be greater than those of the Project.

Wastewater Collection and Treatment

Alternative 3 would have a total of 1,240 residential and 36-hole golf course. The CVWD uses a peak flow factor of 200 gallons per day per EDU to determine wastewater generation. Based on the number of EDUs determined for this Alternative (1,240 residential EDU), this Alternative would generate 0.25 mgd of wastewater, approximately 1.01 mgd fewer than the Project. Similar to the Project, wastewater generated by this Alternative would be treated at the WRP No. 10. Accordingly, available treatment capacity would be provided and impacts would be less than significant under this Alternative with incorporation of applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 3 would be reduced compared to those of the Project.

Dry Utilities (Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications)

Alternative 3 would reduce the number of residential units but increase the amount of open space as compared to the Project, but would continue to develop the whole Project Site and thus would require the same extension of infrastructure. Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would require submittal, review, and approval of plans through the City and relevant utility providers, which would ensure future utility demands would be manageable. Any further need for infrastructure upgrades associated with Alternative 3 would be accomplished through the required design review and approval of electricity, natural gas, and telecommunication plans for Alternative 3 through the City and the appropriate regulatory agencies and utility providers. Even though neither the Project nor this Alternative would result in any potentially significant impact, impacts associated with this Alternative would be reduced when compared to those of the Project. Impacts under this Alternative related to electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications infrastructure would be similar to the Project and impacts would remain less than significant.

Solid Waste

Alternative 3 would have a total of 1,240 residential units and 341 acres of open space, including a 36-hole golf course. **Table 6.0-10: Solid Waste Generation of Alternative 3**, indicates that this Alternative

would generate approximately 508.4 tons per year. Additionally, the golf course would be anticipated to generate some degree of solid waste, but because substantially more of the Project Site is proposed for residential and commercial development instead of recreational open space, it is difficult to make a direct comparison of the total solid waste generation resulting from this Alternative's open space/recreational uses. Further, waste generated from this Alternative's open space/recreational uses is not anticipated to substantially change the conclusions herein. This Alternative would generate roughly 1,159.7 fewer tons per year of solid waste than the Project. As compared to the Project, this Alternative would contribute 3.1 fewer tons of solid waste per day.

Table 6.0-10
Solid Waste Generation of Alternative 3

Building Type	Units	Rate	Solid Waste (tons/year)
Residential	1,240 du	0.41 tons per du	508.4
Total			**508.4**

Source: County of Riverside Environmental Impact Report No. 521, Public Review Draft, March 2014, Table 4.17-N.
Abbreviations: du = dwelling units; sq. ft. = square feet
Note: The solid waste generation rates do not take into account required solid waste reductions.

This Draft EIR concluded that there is adequate capacity and expansion potential within the regional landfill system to accommodate the solid waste expected to be generated by the Project. Since this Alternative would generate less solid waste than the Project, it can be determined that there is similarly adequate capacity within the regional landfill system to accommodate this Alternative. Closure dates of landfills for the existing landfills are estimates and subject to change depending on the actual tonnage that is received prior to their estimated closing date. While this Alternative and the Project would increase demand for waste disposal services, incorporation of similar mitigation would reduce impacts related to solid waste for both to less than significant levels. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 3 would be considered reduced when compared to the Project.

Summary of Comparative Impacts

Alternative 3 would result in incrementally reduced impacts when compared to the Project with respect to aesthetics, air quality, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, population and housing, public services, traffic and transportation, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste. Impacts related to Alternative 3 would be similar with respect to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, noise, recreation, and dry utilities. Alternative 3 would result in greater impacts in comparison to the Project with respect to land use and planning, and

water service and supply. The Project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality and GHG emissions would not be avoided or substantially reduced by this Alternative.

Relationship to Project Objectives

With the implementation of the Approved Eagle Specific Plan, Alternative 3 considers the reduction of the number of residential dwelling units with the inclusion of a 36-hole golf course. The City's intent to implement a high-quality landmark master-planned community on Section 31, one of the last remaining, large, centrally located, vacant parcels in the City, would not be met. Alternative 3 would not provide the highest and best use of land within the City as the residential uses would be limited to only single-family uses. Thus, Alternative 3 would not offer an appropriate mix of uses on the Project Site consistent with the type and intensity of land uses allowed by the City's General Plan land use zoning designations. In addition, Alternative 3 would not include the Grand Oasis lagoon, which serves as a primary feature of the Project. No significant impacts would be avoided or substantially reduced. Furthermore, the following Project objectives would not be achieved with this Alternative:

- To create a landmark community on one of the last remaining, large, centrally located, vacant parcels in Rancho Mirage, offering a range of housing types varying in density and design;
- To create a 21st-century, sustainable development project that will include use of landscaping that is suitable for the native desert environment and feature responsible uses of natural resources, including opportunities for creative approaches to lighting and energy storage and management consistent with the goals of the Rancho Mirage Energy Authority;
- To design a high-quality, master-planned community featuring residential, hotel, mixed-use, and commercial development oriented around a Grand Oasis Crystal lagoon offering substantial new public recreational opportunities to extend the tourism season in Rancho Mirage;
- To develop the Project Site in a manner that reduces vehicular traffic and provides linkage of residential neighborhoods to the Grand Oasis lagoon and the Town Center with paseos for walking and biking and other alternative transportation;
- To create a vibrant resort and mixed-use development that will generate Transit Occupancy Tax (TOT) and sales tax revenue for the City to support long-term economic stability, while also honoring the legacy and history of the area;
- To allow flexibility to respond to changes in commercial, hotel, and residential market demand such that development enabled by the Project can be effectively marketed, funded, and constructed.

4. Alternative 4—Regent Eagle Specific Plan

Alternative Description

The Regent Eagle Specific Plan Alternative ("Alternative 4") examines the impacts that would result from development of the Project Site with the type and intensity of land uses allowed by the Regent Eagle Specific Plan. While never approved by the City, the Regent Eagle Specific Plan was a previously considered development concept for the 618-acre site. Similar to the Project, the Regent Eagle Specific Plan proposed a cohesive mixture of residential and resort hotel commercial land uses with the incorporation of open space and recreational uses, including the development of a Grand Oasis lagoon.

Under Alternative 4, approximately 345 acres of the Project Site would be dedicated for residential uses, allowing for up to 1,316 residential units, and approximately 34 acres would be dedicated for hotel uses, with up to 350 hotel rooms, respectively. Approximately 43 acres of the Project Site would be dedicated for commercial uses, which could accommodate up to approximately 450,000 square feet of commercial retail uses. The recreational uses under Alternative 4 would include the development of a 43-acre Grand Oasis lagoon and a 52-acre golf course. Lastly, there would be approximately 102 acres dedicated for open space and an interior private street system.

Table 6.0-11: Alternative 4 Land Use Summary, presents an estimate of the amount of residential, hotel, commercial retail development, as well as the amount of open space and recreational uses that would be allowed under Alternative 4**.**

Table 6.0-11
Alternative 4 Land Use Summary

Land Use Category	Acreage	Amount
Residential	345 acres	1,316 units
Hotel	34 acres	350 rooms
Commercial	43 acres	450,000 square feet
Golf Course	52 acres	–
Lagoon	43 acres	–
Open Space/Streets	102 acres	–

A total of 1,240 residential units, 350 hotel rooms, and approximately 450,000 square feet of commercial retail development would occur with Alternative 4 as compared to the 1,932 residential and branded resort units, 400 hotel units, and approximately 175,000 square feet of mixed-use core uses the proposed

Section 31 Specific Plan would allow. As with the Project, Alternative 4 would create a cohesive mixture of residential and resort hotel land uses with the incorporation of open space and recreational uses.

Comparative Impact Evaluation

Aesthetics

Alternative 4 would result in similar grading, building, and landscape design as the Project as there would be a similar mix of uses across the 618-acre site. Alternative 4 would incorporate applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures, similar to the Project to reduce impacts to the visual character of the Project Site. Thus, Alternative 4 would result in less than significant impacts to visual character with mitigation. Impacts would be similar to those under the Project.

Air Quality

Construction activities for both Alternative 4 and the Project would produce combustion emissions from various sources, such as on-site heavy-duty construction vehicles, vehicles hauling materials to and from the site, loose dirt from paved site access roadways, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew. Exhaust emissions from construction activities on-site would vary daily as construction activity levels change. Grading activities produce fugitive dust emissions (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) from soil-disturbing activities. It is important to note, grading activities for the entire Project site would remain similar to the Project. As discussed in **Section 5.2: Air Quality**, grading activities would exceed the regional threshold for NOx with mitigation incorporated. However, for purposes of this analysis, the proposed land uses for Alternative 4 were modeled and compared to the Project.

The estimated maximum daily construction emissions based on the proposed land uses for Alternative 4 are provided in **Table 6.0-12: Alternative 4 Maximum Construction Emissions.** As shown, construction activities associated with Alternative 4 would exceed regional concentration thresholds for NOx. Similar to the Project, the analysis assumes implementation of **MM 5.2-1**, that all of the construction equipment activities would occur continuously over the day and that activities would overlap. In addition, based on the recommendation provided by the SCAQMD, implementation of **MM 5.2-2** would require the use of Tier 3 off-road diesel-powered construction equipment equipped with any emissions-control device such as a Level 3 DPF. The measure would be expected to reduce diesel particulate matter by approximately 85 percent or more. Consequently, overall impacts related to construction would be more than under the Project, however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table 6.0-12
Alternative 4 Maximum Construction Emissions

Source	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
	pounds/day					
Unmitigated	73	123	160	<1	31	9
Mitigated	72	118	160	<1	31	9
SCAQMD threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

*Note: Refer to the data sheets in **Appendix B, Alternative 4 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling.***
Mitigated values include compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust and SCAQMD recommended Tier 3 equipment with Level 3 DPF.
Abbreviations: CO = carbon monoxide; NO_X = nitrogen oxide; PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 microns; PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns; ROG = reactive organic gas; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; SO_X = sulfur oxide.

Similar to the Project, operational emissions generated by both stationary and mobile sources would result from normal day-to-day activities associated with the uses that would be permitted by the Project. Source emissions would be generated by the consumption of natural gas and landscape maintenance. Mobile emissions would be generated by the motor vehicles traveling to and from the Project Site. The estimated operational emissions based on the proposed uses for Alternative 4 are shown in **Table 6.0-13: Alternative 4 Maximum Operational Emissions**. As shown, operational emissions would exceed SCAQMD's regional thresholds of significance for VOCs, NOx, and CO. The reason for the increase in CO emissions is primarily due to more vehicles trips under this alternative compared to the Project, an increase of 5,220 net daily trips. Overall impacts related to operational emission would be more than those under the Project due to an increase amount of development on the Project Site, and therefore, would not avoid or substantially lessen to a level of less than significant. As such, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table 6.0-13
Alternative 4 Maximum Operational Emissions

Source	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM 2.5
	pounds/day					
Maximum	141	415	565	2	116	34
SCAQMD threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold exceeded?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**

*Source: Refer to the data sheets in **Appendix B, Alternative 4 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling.***

Biological Resources

Under Alternative 4, the Project Site would result in similar grading and disturbance activities as those of the Project. Since this Alternative would result in development of the entire Project Site, impacts to biological resources would be similar to those of the Project. There would be comparable impacts to sensitive habitat, sensitive plants, and sensitive wildlife, for which applicable Mitigation Measures would be required to mitigate impacts to a less than significant level. Under this Alternative, similar mitigation would be needed to reduce any potential significant impacts to a less than significant level. Both this Alternative and the Project would result in similar, less than significant impacts with mitigation.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 4 would fully develop the entire Project Site with a mixture of residential and commercial uses, as would the Project. This Alternative would have similar potential to uncover previously unknown historical resources, archeological resources, or human remains. Therefore, there would be comparable impacts to cultural resources, for which applicable Mitigation Measures would be required to mitigate impacts to a less than significant level. The appropriate mitigation before and during construction activities would ensure that development would not result in significant impacts to potential cultural resources. Therefore, Alternative 4 would result in less than significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation. Impacts would be similar to those under the Project.

Energy

Under this alternative, there would be up to 1,316 residential units, 350 hotel rooms, 450,000 square feet of commercial retail uses, a 43-acre Grand Oasis lagoon, a 52-acre golf course, and 102 acres open space and an interior private street system, which would result in an increased demand for electricity, and natural gas consumption for both construction and operation. The Project is considering not only energy measures that meet regulatory compliance of local, State, and federal regulations but would also include additional measures for water and energy conservation, which this alternative would not meet all of these encompassing features. However, this alternative would be constructed and designed in accordance with the most current version of Title 24, California's Energy Efficiency Standards for buildings and the State Energy Conservation Standards. These standards include minimum energy efficiency requirements related to building envelope, mechanical systems (e.g., HVAC and water heating systems), indoor and outdoor lighting, and illuminated signs. This Alternative is anticipated to have a similar level of fuel consumption as there would be a comparable level of total development compared to the Project. As such, this alternative would still be less than significant as it would continue to follow local, State, and federal regulatory compliance for energy standards and therefore would not cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction or operation.

Geology and Soils

Alternative 4 would involve comparable construction activities, including grading, for the development of the mixture of residential and commercial uses and would result in similar impacts related to erosion and sedimentation on the Project Site. Thus, this Alternative's grading activities would be identical and would result in similar erosion and sedimentation impacts to those of the Project. Any future development within the Project Site would have to comply with the most current CBC requirements for seismicity, liquefaction, subsidence and expansive soils, which would mitigate potential significant impacts associated with the existing soils and geology conditions of the site. Alternative 4 would be required to develop and implement a SWPPP along with all Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures of the Project pertaining to erosion control plans. For this reason, the geology and soils impacts of this Alternative would be similar to the Project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative 4 would generate GHG emissions from a number of individual sources during both construction and postconstruction (operational) use of the buildings and related activities (e.g., landscape maintenance). Operational activities under Alternative 4 would differ from the Project, as this Alternative would result in a different mix of residential and non-residential development.

As shown in **Table 6.0-14: Alternative 4 Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions,** GHG emissions for Alternative 4 would result in a total of 43,545 MTCO2e annually and 10.6 MTCO2e per service population during buildout, which is greater than the 9.3 MTCO2e per service population for the Project. It is important to note, reduction from compliance with local and state standards, as well as applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures, are not reasonably quantifiable in the CalEEMod model and would provide additional emissions reductions not originally accounted. However, the Project would exceed the SCAQMD threshold of 4.1 MTCO2e per service population during buildout. Impacts against the SCAQMD threshold would remain significant and unavoidable. Overall, Alternative 4 is considered to have a similar impact from GHG emissions as the Project.

Similar to the Project, the SCAQMD would allow substitution of Mitigation Measures that include an enforceable commitment to provide mitigation prior to the occurrence of emissions, including applicable Mitigation Measures. This Alternative would be required to meet the County's emission reductions within the Screening Table. This Alternative would incorporate similar Project Design Features to reduce potential greenhouse gas emission impacts. This Alternative would also be required to comply with the California CalGreen Building Code, the Rancho Mirage Sustainability Plan, and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2016 – 2040 RTP/SCS related to growth forecasts. As such, impacts related to conflicting with applicable plans, policies, or regulations would be less than significant.

Table 6.0-14
Alternative 4 Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG Emissions Source	Emissions (MTCO2e/year)
Construction (amortized)	1,871
Operational (mobile) sources*	26,049
Area sources	44
Energy	12,285
Waste	1,237
Water	2,059
Annual Total	**43,545**
Estimated Service Population (Residents and Employees)[a]	4,104
GHG Efficiency MTCO2e/yr/SP	10.6

Source: CalEEMod Emissions calculations are provided in Appendix B, Alternative 4 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling.

Notes: Totals in table may not appear to add exactly due to rounding in the computer model calculations.

Abbreviations: MTCO2e = metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions.

[a] Alternative 4 consists of 2,665 residents and 1,439 employees

**N2O emissions account for 0.13 MTCO2e/year.*

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative 4 would result in grading and excavating activities across the entire Project Site similar to the Project. The temporary transport, storage, handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction of this Alternative would be comparable to those activities of the Project. While this Alternative involves a reduction of residential uses, and thus a reduction of residents inhabiting the site, it would still result in a similar arrangement of uses and people would still be exposed to potential hazards. The residential uses associated with the operational activities of Alternative 4 would involve the limited use of potentially hazardous materials. There would still be use of hazardous materials associated with the residential, resort commercial, and open space and recreational uses, such as use of pesticides, paints, household cleaners, and landscaping products. The use, storage, and disposal of these hazardous materials would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable standards and regulations. Additionally, since Alternative 4 would also include the Grand Oasis lagoon, Alternative 4 would implement applicable Mitigation related to impacts associated with its operation similar to the Project.

The Project Site is not considered to be a hazardous materials site, nor would this Alternative involve any uses that would cause a significant hazard to those occupants on the site, similar to the Project. This

Alternative would involve similar road closures during construction, but appropriate Mitigation would substantially reduce potential impacts related to impairment of operations of any emergency response plan. Fire hazards would not be associated with this Alternative, as with the Project, since the Project Site contains minimal vegetation that could pose any flammable hazards. Alternative 4 would incorporate similar Project Design Features as the Project that would reduce any foreseeable fire hazards on the Project Site. Therefore, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts. Impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar to those of the Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Similar to the Project, Alternative 4 would require the construction of new storm-drain systems, including retention basins used to retain the 100-year flood event. Construction activities under this Alternative would involve temporary surface water runoff and water quality impacts that would be considered to be potentially significant. As Alternative 4 would also include the Grand Oasis lagoon, implementation of applicable Mitigation Measures, similar to the Project, would minimize impacts associated with risk from a potential seiche condition that may result from seismic activity and to offset the Grand Oasis lagoon private well water usage. In addition, Alternative 4 would implement Project Design Features to minimize surface water runoff from the Project Site and reduce degradation of surface water runoff and water quality, in compliance with the NPDES Program. Therefore, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality, which would be similar to those of the Project.

Land Use and Planning

Implementation of Alternative 4 would develop the Project Site with a mixture of residential, resort hotel, commercial, and open space/recreational uses included in the previously-considered Regent Eagle Specific Plan. This Alternative would include up to 1,316 residential units, up to 350 hotel rooms, and approximately 450,000 square feet of commercial retail space. Additionally, Alternative 4 would include a 43-acre Grand Oasis lagoon, a 52-acre golf course, and approximately 102 combined acres of open space and interior street system area. Alternative 4 would result in an approximately 32 percent reduction in residential units, 50 fewer hotel rooms, and an increase of commercial space by approximately 157 percent as compared to the Project. Additionally, this Alternative would result in an approximately 9-acre larger Grand Oasis lagoon and a golf course.

Alternative 4, like the Project, would not divide an established community and would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Consequently, this Alternative would have similar, less-than-significant impacts with respect to land use and planning.

Noise

Both Alternative 4 and the Project would include earthmoving activities during construction and would involve the use of heavy equipment, such as air compressors, backhoes, generators, graders, pavers, rollers, and scrapers. Construction under Alternative 4 would differ from the Project, as this Alternative would include an increase of 216 single family residential units, a decrease of 50 hotel units, an increase of 275,000 square feet of retail, an increase of 9- acres for the Grand Oasis lagoon, and a 52-acre golf course. This Alternative would not include any multi-family residential units, resulting in a net reduction of 832 multi-family residential units when compared to the Project. Construction equipment sources would cause significant noise impacts to both on- and off-site receptors. Implementation of applicable Mitigation under this Alternative would reduce construction noise and vibration impacts to a less than significant level.

Operational vehicle trips associated with Alternative 4 would result in an increase of 5,220 daily trips when compared to the Project, therefore, long-term operational noise generated by traffic under this Alternative would increase. As discussed in **Section 5.11: Noise**, maximum noise level increases on existing roadways for the Project would be 1.4 dBA (Intersection 1) during the AM peak hour and 1.8 dBA (Intersection 16) during the PM peak hour. The additional 5,220 daily trips added by this Alternative may result in an increase of 3 dBA in the noise levels on roadway segments adjacent to the Project site. Therefore, roadway noise impacts would be greater under this Alternative and impacts would be considered significant.

Single noise events from parking lots and loading docks could be an annoyance to on-site and surrounding residents during certain time periods such as evening and morning hours and may exceed local standards at receptor locations. Similar to the Project, implementation of applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures would require sound attenuation measures be incorporated into the design of stationary noise sources to minimize noise levels which would reduce potentially significant noise impacts to a less than significant level. Impacts under this Alternative to stationary sources would be similar to the Project and impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Population and Housing

Under Alternative 4, the Project Site would include a total of 1,316 residential units, 350 hotel rooms, 450,000 square feet of commercial space, and a 52-acre golf course. Accordingly, the Project Site would contain 616 fewer residential units, 50 fewer hotel rooms, and 275,000 additional square feet of commercial space than enabled by the Project, in addition to a 52-acre golf course not included in the

Section 31 Specific Plan. Alternative 3 would result in 2,655 residents,[17] which is 1,402 fewer residents than the Project. Additionally, this Alternative would generate approximately 525 employees[18] related to the hotel uses, 900 employees[19] related to the commercial uses, and 14 employees[20] related to the golf course and lagoon uses for a combined total of approximately 1,439 employees.[21] This would represent an increase of approximately 401 employees generated when compared to the Project's 1,038 estimated employees.

Similar to the Project, this Alternative would be consistent with City and SCAG population and employment growth projections and policies. However, the reduction in on-site residents would result in a reduced demand on the existing utility infrastructure that services the area when compared to the Project. In addition, Alternative 4 would generate a greater of number of employees compared to the Project, which may draw a substantial number of new residents to fulfill the jobs. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 4 would be less than the Project.

Public Services

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

Both Alternative 4 and the Project would increase demand on RCFD for fire protection and emergency services due to the development of residential, hotel, commercial, and open space uses on the Project Site. The reduction of 616 residential dwelling units and resultant service population associated with Alternative 4 would be anticipated to result in a reduction in the amount of calls for service when compared to the Project. Construction of Alternative 4 would not obstruct emergency access to the site or surrounding areas nor would operational activities impair any response times since the site is located within an area currently serviced by the RCFD. Under this Alternative, all development would comply with the most current adopted fire and building codes and standards and all applicable development impact fees would be paid to the appropriate jurisdiction. Therefore, implementation of this Alternative would not result in the need for new or the physical alternation to any existing governmental facility in regard to fire protection and emergency services, and impacts would be less than significant. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 4 would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

---

17 2.025 persons per household × 1,316 units = 2,665 residents
18 1.5 employees per hotel room × 350 = 525 employees
19 1 employee/500 sq. ft. commercial space × 450,000 sq. ft. = 900 employees
20 95 acres × 0.15 employee/acre = 14 employees
21 County of Riverside Environmental Impact Report No. 521, Public Review Draft, March 2014, Table 4.1-D; open space–recreation employee estimates provided by Pacific Hotels.

Law Enforcement Services

Alternative 4, like the Project, would increase demand on the Sheriff's Department for law enforcement services due to the development of residential, hotel, commercial, and open space uses on the site. While this Alternative would still create additional calls for service, the reduction in residential dwelling units and resultant reduction in service population under this Alternative when compared with the Project would reduce demand on the Sheriff's Department. Like the Project, this Alternative would also incorporate Project Design Features that would enhance security and access throughout the site to reduce needed service from the Sheriff's Department. However, in order to accommodate the Alternative's increased demand for services, the Sheriff's Department would require additional officers to service the site. Mitigation Measures similar to the Project would require payment of development impact fees to the appropriate jurisdiction to reduce impacts to less than significant. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 4 would be considered greater as compared to the Project due to the substantially greater amount of commercial uses proposed, which generally attract a higher volume of visitors than other uses.

School Services

Alternative 4 would increase demand on PSUSD for school services due to development of residential units and the resultant generation of students. As with the Project, Alternative 4 would fall within the attendance boundaries of PSUSD and would be serviced by the three schools of Rancho Mirage Elementary, Nellie N. Coffman Middle, and Rancho Mirage High. Alternative 4 would result in a reduction in the number of students generated because it would include approximately 1,402 fewer residential units than the Project. Alternative 4 would generate approximately 347 students from the residential uses, 49 students from families of employees associated with the commercial uses, and 10 students from families of employees associated with the hotel rooms, for a combined total of 406 students; this represents 98 fewer than the 504 students generated by the Project. The three schools that would service Alternative 4 are currently operating below their capacities and the addition of students generated by this Alternative would not cause any of them to operate over their capacities. Meanwhile, the Project would generate approximately 6 students above the operating capacity of Rancho Mirage Elementary. Therefore, Alternative 4 would result in reduced impacts than the Project. However, the Project's payment of applicable impact fees would be paid to PSUSD to mitigate these impacts to less than significant levels; Alternative 4 would similarly pay applicable impact fees to mitigate impacts to schools. Even though neither this Alternative nor the Project would result in significant impacts, impacts associated with this Alternative would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

Library Services

Alternative 4, like the Project, would increase demand on the Rancho Mirage Public Library for library services. While this Alternative would create additional demand for library services, the reduction in residential dwelling units and resultant decrease in service population under this Alternative when compared to the Project would therefore result in reduced demand on library services when compared to the Project. The Rancho Mirage Library has indicated that it currently has sufficient capacity to accommodate the growing demands of the City, including the Project. However, similar to the Project, this Alternative would require payment of applicable development impact fees to the appropriate jurisdiction. Even though neither this Alternative nor the Project would result in significant impacts, impacts associated with this Alternative would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

Recreation

Alternative 4 would implement similar uses on the Project Site. Thus, Alternative 4 would result in similar demand for parks and recreational facilities due to the increase in residents and visitors on the Project Site when compared to the Project. Alternative 4 would include similar recreation and open space components as the Project, such as the Grand Oasis lagoon; however, it would also include a 52-acre golf course. Like the Project, implementation of Alternative 4 would provide recreation and open spaces throughout the Project Site available for residents and those visiting the Project Site. Applicable mitigation would be implemented when compared to the Project, which includes payment of parkland fees to minimize recreational impacts. Additionally, these recreational facilities would be constructed concurrently with development of the Alternative and would contribute to overall construction impacts. Overall, Alternative 4 would result in less than significant impacts, similar to those of the Project.

Traffic and Transportation

Alternative 4 would include fewer hotel and residential units compared to the Project; however, Alternative 4 would include a greater amount of commercial square footage. As such, Alternative 4 would generate 5,220 additional net new weekday trips, as compared to the Project. Since impacts to study intersections associated with the Project would be less than significant with incorporation of applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures, the incremental increase of trips associated with this Alternative would not be significant. Even though the Project will not have any significant impacts relating to traffic, impacts under this Alternative would be incrementally greater than those under the Project.

Utilities and Service Systems

Water Service and Supply

Alternative 4 would include fewer hotel and residential units compared to the Project; however, Alternative 4 would include a greater amount of commercial square footage, along with a lagoon and golf

course. The water demand associated with this Alternative would be approximately 1,951.71 afy.[22] The aquifer and other sources of supply are adequate for a single dry year and also multiple dry years for a 20-year period. Like the Project, this Alternative would require additional water infrastructure to serve the site. The water demand associated with this Alternative would result in an increase of 421.05 afy when compared to the Project's water demand of 1,530.66 afy. Alternative 4 would result in increased impacts to water service when compared to the Project and unlike the Project, would exceed CVWD's MAWA. Impacts associated with the Project would be less than significant with incorporation of applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures. Alternative 4 would exceed CVWD's MAWA and could result in a potentially significant impact. Accordingly, impacts associated with Alternative 4 would be greater than those of the Project.

Wastewater Collection and Treatment

Alternative 4 would have a total of 1,316 residential dwelling units, 350 hotel rooms, and 450,000 square feet of commercial uses. The CVWD uses a peak flow factor of 200 gallons per day per EDU to determine wastewater generation. Based on the number of EDUs determined for this Alternative (1,240 residential EDU), this Alternative would generate 0.33 mgd of wastewater, approximately 0.93 mgd fewer than the Project. Similar to the Project, wastewater generated by this Alternative would be treated at the WRP No. 10. Accordingly, available treatment capacity would be provided and impacts would be less than significant under this Alternative with incorporation of applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 4 would be reduced compared to those of the Project.

Dry Utilities (Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications)

Alternative 4 would reduce the number of residential and hotel units but increase the amount of commercial space as compared to the Project, but would continue to develop the whole Project Site and thus would require the same extension of infrastructure. Similar to the Project, Alternative 4 would require submittal, review, and approval of plans through the City and relevant utility providers, which would ensure future utility demands would be manageable. Any further need for infrastructure upgrades associated with Alternative 4 would be accomplished through the required design review and approval of electricity, natural gas, and telecommunication plans for Alternative 4 through the City and the appropriate regulatory agencies and utility providers. Even though neither the Project nor this Alternative would result in any potentially significant impact, impacts associated with this Alternative would be reduced when compared to those of the Project. Impacts under this Alternative related to electricity, natural gas, and

22 Residential units = 440.2 acre-feet per year (afy); Residential Open Space = 299.5 afy; Commercial Uses = 1,050.3 afy; Commercial Open Space = 71.6 afy.

telecommunications infrastructure would be similar to the Project and impacts would remain less than significant.

Solid Waste

Alternative 4 would have a total of 1,316 residential dwelling units, 350 hotel rooms, and 450,000 square feet of commercial uses. **Table 6.0-15: Solid Waste Generation of Alternative 4**, indicates that this Alternative would generate approximately 1,987.1 tons per year. Additionally, the golf course would be anticipated to generate some degree of solid waste, but because substantially more of the Project Site is proposed for residential and commercial development instead of recreational open space, it is difficult to make a direct comparison of the total solid waste generation resulting from this Alternative's open space/recreational uses. Further, waste generated from this Alternative's open space/recreational uses is not anticipated to substantially change the conclusions herein. This Alternative would generate roughly 319 more tons per year of solid waste than the Project. As compared to the Project, this Alternative would contribute 0.9 more tons of solid waste per day.

Table 6.0-15
Solid Waste Generation of Alternative 4

Building Type	Units	Rate	Solid Waste (tons/year)
Residential	1,316 du	0.41 tons per du	539.6
Commercial	603,125 sq. ft.	2.4 tons per 1,000 sq. ft.	1,447.5
Total			**1,987.1**

Source: County of Riverside Environmental Impact Report No. 521, Public Review Draft, March 2014, Table 4.17-N.
Abbreviations: du = dwelling units; sq. ft. = square feet
Notes: The solid waste generation rates do not take into account required solid waste reductions. The 350 hotel rooms were estimated to constitute approximately 153,125 sq. ft. and were included in the Commercial building type.

There is adequate capacity and expansion potential within the regional landfill system to accommodate the solid waste expected to be generated by this Alternative or the Project. Closure dates of landfills for the existing landfills are estimates and subject to change depending on the actual tonnage that is received prior to their estimated closing date. While this Alternative and the Project would increase demand for waste disposal services, incorporation of similar mitigation would reduce impacts related to solid waste for both to less than significant levels. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 4 would be comparatively greater than the Project.

Summary of Comparative Impacts

Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts to the Project related to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, recreation, and dry utilities. Alternative 4 would result in incrementally reduced impacts when compared to the Project with respect to population and housing, public services (except law enforcement services), and wastewater collection and treatment. This Alternative would result in greater impacts in comparison to the Project with respect to air quality, noise, traffic and transportation, law enforcement services, water service and supply, and solid waste. The Project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality and GHG emissions would not be avoided or substantially reduced by this Alternative.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Alternative 4 considers the implementation of the Regent Eagle Specific Plan, which was a previously considered development concept for the 618-acre site. Similar to the Project, the Regent Eagle Specific Plan proposed a cohesive mixture of residential and resort hotel commercial land uses, with the incorporation of open space and recreational uses, including the development of the Grand Oasis lagoon. No significant impacts would be avoided or substantially reduced. Furthermore, the following Project objectives would not be achieved with this Alternative:

- To develop the Project Site in a manner that is compatible with surrounding development, including the Sunnylands Estate, Center, and Gardens ("Sunnylands"), by applying appropriate planning, landscaping, and architectural design approaches, including due to the inclusion of a golf course.

The following Project objectives would be partially met:

- To create a landmark community on one of the last remaining, large, centrally located, vacant parcels in Rancho Mirage, offering a range of housing types varying in density and design;
- To design a high-quality, master-planned community featuring residential, hotel, mixed-use, and commercial development oriented around a Grand Oasis Crystal lagoon offering substantial new public recreational opportunities to extend the tourism season in Rancho Mirage;
- To develop the Project Site in a manner that reduces vehicular traffic and provides linkage of residential neighborhoods to the Grand Oasis lagoon and the Town Center with paseos for walking and biking and other alternative transportation;
- To create a vibrant resort and mixed-use development that will generate Transit Occupancy Tax (TOT) and sales tax revenue for the City to support long-term economic stability, while also honoring the legacy and history of the area;

- To create cohesive, central theming for common elements and features while also encouraging high-quality, innovative, and creative design; and
- To allow flexibility to respond to changes in commercial, hotel, and residential market demand such that development enabled by the Project can be effectively marketed, funded, and constructed.

5. Alternative 5—Reduced Intensity Alternative

Alternative Description

The Reduced Intensity Alternative ("Alternative 5") considers implementation of the Project as proposed, with the reduction of intensity of all land uses. As shown in **Table 6.0-16: Alternative 5 Land Use Summary**, Alternative 5 would implement the same land use categories as the Project, but would include the development of 890 residential units, up to 250 hotels rooms, and approximately 100,000 square feet of resort hotel commercial land uses. Alternative 5 would also incorporate various open space and recreational uses, as well as the 34-acre Grand Oasis lagoon.

Table 6.0-16
Alternative 5 Land Use Summary

Land Use Category	Acreage	Amount
Mixed Use Core	79.8	100,000 square feet + 250 hotel rooms
Residential	504.2	890 units
Lagoon	34	–

Under Alternative 5, the layout of the land uses would not change as compared to the Project. As a result of the reduction of the amount of development on the Project Site, buildings under Alternative 5 would not exceed 2-stories in height, compared to the 4-story maximum height proposed under the Project for the Town Center. The reduction in development on the 618-acre Project Site would allow for the ability to integrate more parks, walkways and jogging paths, enhanced streetscapes, courtyards, and plazas throughout the design of the Project Site.

Comparative Impact Evaluation

Aesthetics

Under Alternative 5, the Project Site would be developed according to the land use plan of the Project with the reduced intensity of uses. This Alternative would change the visual nature of the Project Site, as would the Project, but the aesthetic changes would be of less intensity. Development of the Project Site in conformance with the Specific Plan's development and design standards, through incorporation of Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures, would not result in significant impacts to the visual

character of the Project Site and the surrounding area. As the entire 618-acre site would still be fully developed, the aesthetic impacts of this Alternative would be similar to the Project, but to a lesser degree. Therefore, Alternative 5 would have less than significant impacts, but reduced compared to those of the Project.

Air Quality

Construction activities for both Alternative 5 and the Project would produce combustion emissions from various sources, such as on-site heavy-duty construction vehicles, vehicles hauling materials to and from the site, loose dirt from paved site access roadways, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew. Exhaust emissions from construction activities on-site would vary daily as construction activity levels change. Grading activities produce fugitive dust emissions (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) from soil-disturbing activities. It is important to note, grading activities for the entire Project site would remain similar to the Project. As discussed in **Section 5.2: Air Quality**, grading activities would exceed the regional threshold for NOx with mitigation incorporated. However, for purposes of this analysis, the proposed land uses for Alternative 5 were modeled and compared to the Project.

The estimated maximum daily construction emissions based on the proposed land uses for Alternative 5 are provided in **Table 6.0-17: Alternative 5 Maximum Construction Emissions.** As shown, construction activities associated with Alternative 5 would not exceed regional concentration thresholds. Although emissions under this alternative would be below regional concentration thresholds, implementation of **MM 5.2-1** and **5.2-2** would further reduce emissions from construction. These measures would be expected to reduce diesel particulate matter by approximately 85 percent or more. Consequently, overall impacts related to construction would be less than under the Project and less than significant.

Table 6.0-17
Alternative 5 Maximum Construction Emissions

Source	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
	pounds/day					
Unmitigated	44	64	79	<1	14	4
Mitigated	42	58	80	<1	14	4
SCAQMD threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

*Note: Refer to the data sheets in **Appendix B, Alternative 5 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling.***
Mitigated values include compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust and SCAQMD recommended Tier 3 equipment with Level 3 DPF.
Abbreviations: CO = carbon monoxide; NO_X = nitrogen oxide; PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 microns; PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns; ROG = reactive organic gas; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; SO_X = sulfur oxide.

Similar to the Project, operational emissions generated by both stationary and mobile sources would result from normal day-to-day activities associated with the uses that would be permitted by the Project. Source emissions would be generated by the consumption of natural gas and landscape maintenance. Mobile emissions would be generated by the motor vehicles traveling to and from the Project Site. The estimated operational emissions based on the proposed uses for Alternative 5 are shown in **Table 6.0-18: Alternative 5 Maximum Operational Emissions**. As shown, operational emissions would exceed SCAQMD's regional thresholds of significance for VOCs and NOx, but not CO as with the Project. The reason for the reduction in CO emissions is primarily due to the lower amount of vehicles trips under this alternative compared to the Project, a decrease of 10,384 net daily trips Impacts related to operational emission would be less than those under the Project, however, would not avoid or substantially lessen to a level of less than significant. As such, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table 6.0-18
Alternative 5 Maximum Operational Emissions

Source	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM 2.5
	pounds/day					
Maximum	79	194	298	1	59	18
SCAQMD threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold exceeded?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

*Source: Refer to the data sheets in **Appendix B, Alternative 5 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling.***

Biological Resources

Under Alternative 3, the Project Site would result in similar grading and disturbance activities as those of the Project. Since this Alternative would result in development of the entire Project Site, impacts to biological resources would be similar to those of the Project. There would be comparable impacts to sensitive habitat, sensitive plants, and sensitive wildlife, for which applicable Mitigation Measures would be required to mitigate impacts to a less than significant level. Under this Alternative, similar mitigation would be needed to reduce any potential significant impacts to a less than significant level. Both this Alternative and the Project would result in similar, less than significant impacts with mitigation.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 5 would fully develop the entire Project Site with a mixture of residential and commercial uses, as would the Project. This Alternative would have similar potential to uncover previously unknown historical resources, archeological resources, or human remains. Therefore, there would be comparable

impacts to cultural resources, for which applicable Mitigation Measures would be required to mitigate impacts to a less than significant level. The appropriate mitigation before and during the construction activities would ensure that development would not result in significant impacts to potential cultural resources. Therefore, Alternative 5 would result in less than significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation. Impacts would be similar to those of the Project.

Energy

Under this alternative, there would be up to 890 residential units, 250 hotels rooms, and approximately 100,000 square feet of resort hotel commercial land uses, and a 34-acre Grand Oasis lagoon, which would result in an increased demand for electricity, and natural gas consumption for both construction and operation. The Project is considering not only energy measures that meet regulatory compliance of local, State, and federal regulations but would also include additional measures for water and energy conservation, which this alternative would not meet all of these encompassing features. However, this alternative would be constructed and designed in accordance with the most current version of Title 24, California's Energy Efficiency Standards for buildings and the State Energy Conservation Standards. These standards include minimum energy efficiency requirements related to building envelope, mechanical systems (e.g., HVAC and water heating systems), indoor and outdoor lighting, and illuminated signs. This alternative would have a reduced fuel consumption due to having fewer vehicle trips compared to the Project. As such, the overall impacts of this alternative would be reduced as compared to the Project due to a decrease energy consumption. Therefore, this alternative would be less than significant as it would continue to follow local, State, and federal regulatory compliance for energy standards and therefore would not cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction or operation.

Geology and Soils

Alternative 5 would involve comparable construction activities, including grading, for the development of the mixture of residential and commercial uses and would result in similar impacts related to erosion and sedimentation on the Project Site. Thus, this Alternative's grading and excavation activities would result in similar erosion and sedimentation impacts to those of the Project. Any development within the Project Site associated with Alternative 5 would have to comply with the CBC requirements for seismicity, liquefaction, subsidence, and expansive soils, similar to the Project, which would mitigate potential significant impacts associated with the existing soils and geology conditions of the site. Alternative 5 would be required to develop and implement a SWPPP along with all Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures of the Project pertaining to erosion control plans. For this reason, the geology and soils impacts of this Alternative would be similar to the Project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative 5 would generate GHG emissions from a number of individual sources during both construction and postconstruction (operational) use of the buildings and related activities (e.g., landscape maintenance). Operational activities under Alternative 5 would differ from the Project, as this Alternative would result in an overall decreased amount of development.

As shown in **Table 6.0-19: Alternative 5 Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions,** GHG emissions for Alternative 5 would result in a total of 22,977 MTCO2e annually and 9.6 MTCO2e per service population during buildout. It is important to note, reduction from compliance with local and State standards, as well as applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures, are not reasonably quantifiable in the CalEEMod model and would provide additional emissions reductions not originally accounted. However, the Project would exceed the SCAQMD threshold of 4.1 MTCO2e per service population during buildout. Impacts against the SCAQMD threshold would remain significant and unavoidable. Overall, Alternative 5 would have reduced impacts related to GHG emissions as compared to the Project.

Similar to the Project, the SCAQMD would allow substitution of Mitigation Measures that include an enforceable commitment to provide mitigation prior to the occurrence of emissions, including **PDF 5.7-1** through **PDF 5.7-3** and **MM 5.7-1** through **5.7-9**. This Alternative would be required to meet the County's emission reductions within the Screening Table. This Alternative would incorporate similar Project Design Features to reduce potential greenhouse gas emission impacts. This Alternative would also be required to comply with the California CalGreen Building Code, the Rancho Mirage Sustainability Plan, and the SCAG 2016 – 2040 RTP/SCS related to growth forecasts. As such, impacts related to conflicting with applicable plans, policies, or regulations would be less than significant.

Table 6.0-19
Alternative 5 Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG Emissions Source	Emissions (MTCO2e/year)
Construction (amortized)	880
Operational (mobile) sources*	12,809
Area sources	30
Energy	7,633
Waste	716
Water	909
Annual Total	**22,977**
Estimated Service Population (Residents and Employees)[a]	2,382
GHG Efficiency MTCO2e/yr/SP	9.6

Source: CalEEMod Emissions calculations are provided in Appendix B, Alternative 5 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling5

Notes: Totals in table may not appear to add exactly due to rounding in the computer model calculations.

Abbreviations: MTCO2e = metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions.

[a] Alternative 5 consists of 1,802 residents and 580 employees.

**N2O emissions account for 0.14 MTCO2e/year.*

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

While Alternative 5 would result in a reduction in the intensity of uses on the 618-acre site, it would still involve similar grading and excavating activities as would the Project. The temporary transport, storage, handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction of this Alternative would compare to those activities of the Project, but at a reduced level. The residential and resort commercial uses associated with the operational activities of Alternative 5 would involve a reduced use of potentially hazardous materials, which would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable standards and regulations. Additionally, since Alternative 5 would also include the Grand Oasis lagoon, Alternative 5 would implement Mitigation related to impacts associated with its operation similar to the Project.

The Project Site is not considered to be a hazardous materials site, nor would this Alternative involve any uses that would cause a significant hazard to those occupants on the site, similar to the Project. This Alternative would involve similar road closures during construction, but appropriate Mitigation would substantially reduce potential impacts related to impairment of operations of any emergency response plan. Fire hazards would not be associated with this Alternative, as with the Project, since the Project Site contains minimal vegetation that could pose any flammable hazards. Alternative 5 would incorporate

similar Project Design Features as the Project that would reduce any foreseeable fire hazards on the Project Site. Therefore, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts. Impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar to those of the Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Similar to the Project, Alternative 5 would require the construction of new storm-drain systems, including retention basins used to retain the 100-year flood event. Construction activities under this Alternative would involve temporary surface water runoff and water quality impacts that would be considered to be potentially significant. As Alternative 5 would also include the Grand Oasis lagoon, implementation of applicable Mitigation Measures, similar to the Project, would minimize impacts associated with risk from a potential seiche condition that may result from seismic activity and to offset the Grand Oasis lagoon private well water usage. In addition, Alternative 5 would implement Project Design Features to minimize surface water runoff from the Project Site and reduce degradation of surface water runoff and water quality, in compliance with the NPDES Program. Therefore, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality, which would be similar to those of the Project.

Land Use and Planning

Implementation of Alternative 5 would be developed with the identical mixture of residential and commercial uses as the Project, but with a reduction in intensity of all land uses. A total of 890 residential units, up to 250 hotel rooms, and approximately 100,000 square feet of resort hotel commercial space would be developed on the Project Site compared to the Project's 1,932 residential dwelling units, 400 hotel rooms, and 175,000 square feet of commercial space. The difference would amount to 1,042 fewer residential units, 150 fewer hotel rooms, and 75,000 less square feet of commercial space.

Alternative 5, like the Project, would not divide an established community and would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Alternative 5 would result in similar impacts to land use and planning when compared to the Project.

Noise

Both Alternative 5 and the Project would include earthmoving activities during construction and would involve the use of heavy equipment, such as air compressors, backhoes, generators, graders, pavers, rollers, and scrapers. Construction under Alternative 5 would differ from the Project, as this Alternative would include a decrease of 210 single-family residential units, a decrease of 150 hotel rooms, and a decrease of 75,000 square-feet of retail. This Alternative would not include multi-family residential units resulting in a net reduction of 832 multi-family units when compared to the Project. Construction

equipment sources would cause significant noise impacts to both on- and off-site receptors. Implementation of applicable Mitigation Measures under this Alternative would reduce construction noise and vibration impacts to a less than significant level.

Operational vehicle trips associated with Alternative 5 would result in a decrease of 10,384 daily trips when compared to the Project, therefore, long-term operational noise generated by traffic under this Alternative would decrease. Impacts related to operational roadway noise would be less than those under the Project, however, impacts would remain less than significant.

Single noise events from parking lots and loading docks could be an annoyance to on-site and surrounding residents during certain time periods such as evening and morning hours and may exceed local standards at receptor locations. Similar to the Project, implementation of applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures would require sound attenuation measures be incorporated into the design of stationary noise sources to minimize noise levels which would reduce potentially significant noise impacts to a less than significant level. Impacts under this Alternative to stationary sources would be similar to the Project and impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Population and Housing

Under Alternative 5, the Project Site would involve a reduction in intensity of all land uses, proving a total of 890 residential units, up to 250 hotel rooms, and approximately 100,000 square feet of commercial space. The difference would amount to 1,042 fewer residential units, 150 fewer hotel rooms, and 75,000 less square feet of commercial space than the Project. Alternative 5 would result in 1,802 residents,[23] which is 2,111 fewer residents than the Project. Additionally, this Alternative would generate approximately 375 employees[24] related to the hotel rooms, 200 employees[25] related to the commercial space, and 5 employees[26] related to the lagoon use, for a combined total of 580 employees, which is ??? fewer employees than the project.[27]

Similar to the Project, this Alternative would be consistent with City and SCAG population and employment growth projections and policies. However, the reduction in on-site residents would result in a reduced demand on the existing utility infrastructure that services the area when compared to the Project. Even

23 2.025 persons per household × 890 units = 1,802 residents
24 1.5 employees per hotel room × 250 = 375 employees
25 1 employee/500 sq. ft. commercial space × 100,000 sq. ft. = 200 employees
26 34 acres × 0.15 employee/acre = 5 employees
27 County of Riverside Environmental Impact Report No. 521, Public Review Draft, March 2014, Table 4.1-D; open space–recreation employee estimates provided by Pacific Hotels.

though neither the Project nor Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 5 would be less than the Project.

Public Services

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

Both Alternative 5 and the Project would increase demand on RCFD for fire protection and emergency services due to the development of residential, hotel, commercial, and open space uses on the Project Site. The reduction of 1,042 residential dwelling units and resultant service population associated with Alternative 5 would be anticipated to result in a reduction in the amount of calls for service when compared to the Project. Construction of Alternative 5 would not obstruct emergency access to the site or surrounding areas nor would operational activities impair any response times since the site is located within an area currently serviced by the RCFD. Under this Alternative, all development would comply with the most current adopted fire and building codes and standards and all applicable development impact fees would be paid to the appropriate jurisdiction. Therefore, implementation of this Alternative would not result in the need for new or the physical alternation to any existing governmental facility in regard to fire protection and emergency services, and impacts would be less than significant. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 5 would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

Law Enforcement Services

Alternative 5, like the Project, would increase demand on the Sheriff's Department for law enforcement services due to the development of residential, open space, and mixed-use hotel and commercial uses on the site. While this Alternative would still create additional calls for service, the reduction in residential dwelling units and resultant reduction in service population under this Alternative when compared with the Project would reduce demand on the Sheriff's Department. Like the Project, this Alternative would also incorporate Project Design Features that would enhance security and access throughout the site to reduce needed service from the Sheriff's Department. However, in order to accommodate the Alternative's increased demand for services, the Sheriff's Department would require additional officers to service the site. Mitigation Measures similar to the Project would require payment of development impact fees to the appropriate jurisdiction to reduce impacts to less than significant. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 5 would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

School Services

Alternative 5 would increase demand on PSUSD for school services due to development of residential units and the resultant generation of students. As with the Project, Alternative 5 would fall within the attendance boundaries of PSUSD and would be serviced by the three schools of Rancho Mirage Elementary, Nellie N. Coffman Middle, and Rancho Mirage High. Alternative 5 would result in a reduction in the number of students generated because it would include approximately 1,402 fewer residential units than the Project. Alternative 5 would generate approximately 298 students from the residential uses, 13 students from families of employees associated with the commercial uses, and 11 students from families of employees associated with the hotel rooms, for a combined total of 322 students; this represents 182 fewer than the 504 students generated by the Project. The three schools that would service Alternative 5 are currently operating below their capacities and the addition of students generated by this Alternative would not cause any of them to operate over their capacities. Meanwhile, the Project would generate approximately 6 students above the operating capacity of Rancho Mirage Elementary. Therefore, Alternative 5 would result in reduced impacts than the Project. However, the Project's payment of applicable impact fees would be paid to PSUSD to mitigate these impacts to less than significant levels; Alternative 5 would similarly pay applicable impact fees to mitigate impacts to schools. Even though neither this Alternative nor the Project would result in significant impacts, impacts associated with this Alternative would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

Library Services

Alternative 5, like the Project, would increase demand on the Rancho Mirage Public Library for library services. While this Alternative would create additional demand for library services, the reduction in residential dwelling units and resultant decrease in service population under this Alternative when compared to the Project would therefore result in reduced demand on library services when compared to the Project. The Rancho Mirage Library has indicated that it currently has sufficient capacity to accommodate the growing demands of the City, including the Project. However, similar to the Project, this Alternative would require payment of applicable development impact fees to the appropriate jurisdiction. Even though neither this Alternative nor the Project would result in significant impacts, impacts associated with this Alternative would be considered reduced as compared to the Project.

Recreation

Alternative 5 would implement similar uses on the Project Site, but at a reduced intensity. Thus, Alternative 5 would result in similar demand for parks and recreational facilities due to the increase in residents and visitors on the Project Site when compared to the Project. Alternative 5 would include similar recreation and open space components as the Project; however, the Grand Oasis lagoon would be reduced in size.

Like the Project, implementation of Alternative 5 would provide recreation and open spaces throughout the Project Site available for residents and those visiting the Project Site. However, it is unlikely that the Alternative would contain the same level of recreation as proposed by the Project. On the other hand, this Alternative's reduction in residential and commercial development on the site would involve the ability to integrate more space for recreational opportunities within the Alternative's land use design. This increase in recreational opportunity on the site would help minimize the increased demand on existing City parks and recreational facilities as a result of the increased population generation. Applicable mitigation would be implemented when compared to the Project, which includes payment of parkland fees to minimize recreational impacts. Additionally, these recreational facilities would be constructed concurrently with development of the Alternative and would contribute to overall construction impacts. Overall, Alternative 5 would result in less than significant impacts, similar to those of the Project.

Traffic and Transportation

Alternative 5 would reduce the number of residential and hotel units and other land uses when compared to the Project. Alternative 5 would result in 10,384 fewer net new trips than the Project. Since impacts to study intersections associated with the Project would be less than significant with incorporation of applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures, the impacts associated with Alternative 5 would also be less than significant. Alternative 5 would result in incrementally less traffic, but both the Project and Alternative 5 would have less than significant impacts.

Utilities and Service Systems

Water Service and Supply

Alternative 5 would reduce the number of residential and hotel units and other land uses when compared to the Project, but would continue to develop the whole Project Site. The water demand associated with this Alternative would be approximately 930.08 afy.[28] The water demand associated with this Alternative would result in a decrease of 600.58 afy when compared to the Project's water demand of 1,530.66 afy. The aquifer and other sources of supply are adequate for a single dry year and also multiple dry years for a 20-year period. Since the water demand associated with this Alternative is less than the Project water demand, Alternative 5 would result in an incremental reduction in total water use, but would require the same extension of infrastructure. Additionally, similar to the Project, Alternative 5 would meet CVWD's MAWA requirements. Even though neither the Project nor this Alternative would result in any potentially

28 Residential units = 348.67 acre-feet per year (afy); Hotel Rooms = 61.93 afy; Commercial Uses = 40.47 afy; Open Space = 478.98 afy.

significant impact, impacts associated with this Alternative would be reduced when compared to those of the Project.

Wastewater Collection and Treatment

Under Alternative 5, the Project Site would be developed according to the Project's land use plan, but with a reduction in the intensity of residential and resort commercial uses. This Alternative would generate 0.23 mgd of wastewater, approximately 1.03 mgd fewer than the Project, and wastewater generated by this Alternative would be treated at WRP No. 10. Accordingly, available treatment capacity would be provided and impacts would be less than significant under this Alternative. The Alternative's sewage increase to the lines in the CVWD's sewer capacity would be mitigated through payment of the sewer capacity increase fee, as required by the Project. Thus, Alternative 5 impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. Even though neither the Project nor this Alternative would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with this Alternative would be considered reduced when compared to the Project.

Dry Utilities (Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications)

Alternative 5 would reduce the number of residential and hotel units and other land uses when compared to the Project, but would continue to develop the whole Project Site and thus would require the same extension of infrastructure. Similar to the Project, Alternative 5 would require submittal, review, and approval of plans through the City and relevant utility providers, which would ensure future utility demands would be manageable. Any further need for infrastructure upgrades associated with Alternative 5 would be accomplished through the required design review and approval of electricity, natural gas, and telecommunication plans for Alternative 5 through the City and the appropriate regulatory agencies and utility providers. Even though neither the Project nor this Alternative would result in any potentially significant impact, impacts associated with this Alternative would be reduced when compared to those of the Project. Impacts under this Alternative related to electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications infrastructure would be similar to the Project and impacts would remain less than significant.

Solid Waste

As mentioned previously, under Alternative 5, the Project Site would be developed according to the Project's land use plan, but with a reduction in the intensity of residential and resort commercial uses. Alternative 5 would have a total of 890 residential dwelling units, 250 hotel rooms, and 100,000 square feet of commercial space. **Table 6.0-20: Solid Waste Generation of Alternative 5**, indicates that this Alternative would generate approximately 867.4 tons per year. This Alternative would generate roughly 800.7 fewer tons per year of solid waste than the Project. As compared to the Project, this Alternative would contribute 2.3 fewer tons of solid waste per day.

Table 6.0-20
Solid Waste Generation of Alternative 5

Building Type	Units	Rate	Solid Waste (tons/year)
Residential	890 du	0.41 tons per du	364.9
Commercial	209,375 sq. ft.	2.4 tons per 1,000 sq. ft.	502.5
Total			**867.4**

Source: County of Riverside Environmental Impact Report No. 521, Public Review Draft, March 2014, Table 4.17-N.
Abbreviations: du = dwelling units; sq. ft. = square feet
Notes: The solid waste generation rates do not take into account required solid waste reductions. The 250 hotel rooms were estimated to constitute approximately 109,375 sq. ft. and were included in the Commercial building type.

There is adequate capacity and expansion potential within the regional landfill system to accommodate the solid waste expected to be generated by this Alternative or the Project. Closure dates of landfills for the existing landfills are estimates and subject to change depending on the actual tonnage that is received prior to their estimated closing date. While this Alternative and the Project would increase demand for waste disposal services, incorporation of similar mitigation would reduce impacts related to solid waste for both to less than significant levels. Even though neither the Project nor Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact, impacts associated with Alternative 5 would be reduced when compared to the Project.

Summary of Comparative Impacts

Alternative 5 would result in an incremental reduction in air quality impacts during operation of the Project. Impacts related to Alternative 5 would be similar to those for the Project related to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, recreation, and dry utilities. Impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, population and housing, public services, traffic and transportation, water service and supply, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste would be reduced compared to the Project. The Project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality and GHG emissions would not be avoided or substantially reduced by this Alternative.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Alternative 5 considers the implementation of the land use plan of the Project, but at a reduced intensity throughout the Project Site. Many impacts would be incrementally reduced with this Alternative. However, the significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality and noise would not be avoided or reduced to a level of less than significant. This Alternative would not offer an appropriate mix of uses on the Project Site consistent with the type and intensity of land uses allowed by the City's General Plan land use zoning designations. Alternative 5 is not anticipated to provide sufficient hotel rooms and commercial uses within

the Town Center such that the Grand Oasis would be economically feasible. Further, this Alternative would provide less available housing and employment opportunities for the region, resulting in fewer economic development opportunities and a reduced regional destination development. While Alternative 5 would include all the components of the Project, it would only partially meet all of the following Project objectives.

E. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

As previously discussed, analysis of a reasonable range of Alternatives is required by CEQA. The purpose of the Alternatives analysis is to explain potentially feasible ways to avoid or minimize the significant effects identified for the Project. Furthermore, State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires an EIR to identify an environmentally superior Alternative among those evaluated in an EIR.

A summary comparison of impacts associated with the Project Alternatives is provided in **Table 6.0-21: Comparison of Alternatives to Project**. As indicated in **Table 6.0-21**, the first line compares the Alternative's incremental increase, decrease, or results in similar impacts, to the Project's identified impact. The second line below that comparison then compares the level of significance of the Alternative's impact to the level of significance of the Project's impact. Of the Alternatives considered in this Draft EIR section, the No Project/No Development Alternative is environmentally superior to the other Alternatives, because this Alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the Project.

According to the State CEQA Guidelines, if the No Project/No Development Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior Alternative, the Draft EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior Alternative among the other Alternatives. Of the other Alternatives considered, Alternative 5, the Reduced Intensity Alternative, would be considered environmentally superior, because it would result in the greatest incremental reduction of the overall level of impact when compared to the Project. Alternative 5 would reduce, but not avoid or reduce to a level of less than significant, the significant construction and operational air quality impacts related to air quality and compliance with local and State standards for greenhouse gas emission reductions identified for the Project.

As the Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop all of the components proposed by the Project, this Alternative would be consistent with the objective to establish a high-quality, master-planned community featuring residential, hotel, mixed-use, and commercial development oriented around a Grand Oasis lagoon. However, Alternative 5 would not meet the objective to reflect consistency with the goals and policies of the City's current General Plan for the Project Site. Since this Alternative would develop a reduced amount of uses compared to the Project, this objective would not be achieved to the same extent as the Project. Lastly, Alternative 5 is unlikely to be financially feasible as its reduced densities would

generate substantially less revenue, which may be insufficient to meet the cost of the development of the Grand Oasis lagoon.

Overall, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not meet the Project's purpose and the objectives that support the Project's purpose to the same extent as the Project.

Table 6.0-21
Comparison of Alternatives to Project

Environmental Issue Area	Project	Alternative 1—No Project/No Development	Alternative 2—Existing General Plan	Alternative 3—Approved Eagle Specific Plan	Alternative 4—Regent Eagle Specific Plan	Alternative 5—Reduced Intensity
Aesthetics	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
Air Quality	Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced (No impact)	Reduced (Significant and Unavoidable)	Reduced (Significant and Unavoidable)	Greater (Significant and Unavoidable)	Reduced (Significant and Unavoidable)
Biological Resources	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Cultural Resources	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Energy	Less than Significant	Reduced (No impact)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
Geology and Soils	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced (No impact)	Reduced (Significant and Unavoidable)	Reduced (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Reduced (Significant and Unavoidable)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)

Environmental Issue Area	Project	Alternative 1—No Project/No Development	Alternative 2—Existing General Plan	Alternative 3—Approved Eagle Specific Plan	Alternative 4—Regent Eagle Specific Plan	Alternative 5—Reduced Intensity
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Land Use and Planning	Less than Significant	Greater (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Greater (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Noise	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Population and Housing	Less than Significant	Reduced (No impact)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
Law Enforcement Services	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Greater (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
School Services	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
Library Services	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)

Environmental Issue Area	Project	Alternative 1—No Project/No Development	Alternative 2—Existing General Plan	Alternative 3—Approved Eagle Specific Plan	Alternative 4—Regent Eagle Specific Plan	Alternative 5—Reduced Intensity
Recreation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Greater (No impact)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Traffic and Transportation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Greater (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
Water Service and Supply	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Greater (Less than Significant)	Greater (Less than Significant)	Greater (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
Wastewater Collection and Treatment	Less than Significant	Reduced (No impact)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
Dry Utilities (Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications)	Less than Significant	Reduced (No Impact)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Solid Waste	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced (No impact)	Greater (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Greater (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)