

# CHAPTER 5

## ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

---

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(a), requires an EIR to “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” This chapter discusses a range of alternatives to the proposed project, including alternative locations, alternative designs, and a No Project Alternative. The CEQA Guidelines provide direction for the discussion of alternatives to the proposed project. This section requires:

- Description of “...a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of a project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” [§15126.6(a)]
- A setting forth of alternatives that “...shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project.” [§15126.6(f)]
- Discussion of the “No Project” alternative, and “If the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” [§15126.6(e)(2)]
- Discussion and analysis of alternative locations “...that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project...”; only these need to be considered for inclusion in the EIR. [§15126.6(f)(2)(A)]

Given the CEQA mandates listed above, this section: (1) describes the range of reasonable alternatives to the project; (2) examines and evaluates resource issue areas where significant adverse environmental effects have been identified and compares the impacts of the alternatives to those of the proposed project; and (3) identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

### 5.2 ALTERNATIVES SELECTION

In defining the feasibility of alternatives, the CEQA Guidelines state: “Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site.” Through the scoping process, if an alternative was found to be infeasible, as defined above, then it was dropped from further consideration. In addition, CEQA states that alternatives should “...attain most of the basic objectives of the project...”

### **5.2.1 Project Objectives**

The basic objectives of the proposed project that were used in the screening of project alternatives are taken from Chapter 2 and include the following:

- Develop a plan consistent with County San Luis Bay Area Plan standards, the County's CP, and the Coastal Act;
- Provide a range and mix of uses, with emphasis on coastal related and visitor serving uses, including low and moderate cost overnight accommodations (campsites as stipulated in the LCP), so that the land is financially and physically supportive of Harbor District operations and functions;
- Provide a range and mix of uses that enhances the public's enjoyment of the Port and serves the needs of harbor users, including retail uses that are complementary to the harbor;
- Reserve area on Harbor Terrace to accommodate current and future Harbor District and other user needs including gear and trailer boat storage, and other harbor uses.
- Include overnight accommodations and commercial uses; make-up of overnight accommodations shall comply with LCP requirements that stipulate campsites shall be provided in specified ratios as related to unit count of RV and hotel/motel accommodations.
- Encourage new development to integrate site and building design techniques that are environmentally sensitive and energy conserving.
- In new visitor serving developments on Harbor Terrace, incorporate measures to provide safe pedestrian access on- and off-site and coordinate access to the beach and other Port facilities.
- Allow trailer boat and gear storage, eating and drinking establishments, food and beverage retail sales (e.g., market or commissary), paths, trails, scenic overlooks and sightseeing facilities, public parking, picnicking, accessory storage, hotels and motels (camping, bungalows, tent cabins, inns, casitas, bed and breakfast), recreational vehicle parks, meeting facilities, group camping, passive recreation, outdoor retail sales, Harbor Operations (including offices, storage and maintenance yard), public safety facilities, temporary events, interpretive displays and exhibits, shuttle station, aquaculture-supporting uses and mariculture-supporting uses.
- Prohibit extension of roads, infrastructure, services, or other development connections through the Harbor Terrace property to other non-Harbor District properties. This restriction does not preclude trailhead or beach and bluff access connections.

### **5.2.2 San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan**

The project objectives listed above are similar to the goals and standards specific to Harbor Terrace identified in the San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan. These standards are incorporated into the County's LCP; therefore, feasible alternatives must be consistent with identified policies. The project area was subject to review by the Harbor District, County, and CCC through preparation of the Port Master Plan and Final Program EIR, and subsequent adopted General

Plan and LCP amendments to incorporate the policies and standards into the San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan. Therefore, no modifications or amendments to the County General Plan and LCP are proposed, and only alternatives that are consistent with the County General Plan and LCP are considered for further review. Applicable San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan standards include the following:

**Goal: Harbor Terrace encompasses a mix of uses that enhances the public's enjoyment of the Port, serves the needs of harbor users, and may augment Port income.**

1. **Development Intent.** Development of the Harbor Terrace Planning Sub-Area shall provide a range and mix of uses, with emphasis on coastal related and visitor serving uses, so that the land is financially and physically supportive of Harbor District operations.
2. **Harbor Users.** Reserve area on Harbor Terrace to accommodate current and future Harbor District and other user needs including gear storage, trailer boat storage, and other harbor uses.
3. **Visitor Uses.** Provide visitor-serving retail uses that are complementary to the harbor so that this area may enhance the public's enjoyment in ways that financially and physically support the Harbor District's public functions. Include overnight accommodations and commercial uses according to market demand and feasibility. Overnight accommodations shall include affordable visitor serving facilities.
4. **Environmental Performance.** Encourage new development to integrate site and building design techniques that are environmentally sensitive and energy conserving.
5. **Pedestrian Access.** New visitor serving developments on Harbor Terrace shall incorporate measures to provide safe pedestrian access onsite and coordinate access to the beach and other Port facilities.
6. **Limitation on Use.** Allow trailer boat and gear storage, eating and drinking establishments, food and beverage retail sales (e.g., market or commissary), yachting and rowing clubs, paths, trails, scenic overlooks and sightseeing facilities, public parking, picnicking, accessory storage, hotels and motels (camping, bungalows, tent cabins, inns, casitas, bed and breakfast), recreational vehicle parks, meeting facilities, group camping, passive recreation, communication facilities, specialized programs, outdoor retail sales, Harbor Operations (including offices, storage and maintenance yard), public safety facilities, temporary events, interpretive displays and exhibits, shuttle station, aquaculture and mariculture.
7. **Trailer Park.** The existing trailer park shall be closed, consolidated, or relocated consistent with the California Harbors and Navigation Code §6086 and Government Code §65863 prior to, or concurrent with, any approved development of the site. The mobile home park shall be consolidated, closed, or relocated, in a manner that maximizes the area available for coastal dependent and coastal related land uses prior to or concurrent with any approved development of the site.

8. **Parcel Acquisition.** *The Harbor District shall pursue acquisition of necessary property adjacent to Harbor Terrace to implement the Port Master Plan Improvements.*
9. **Service Restriction.** *Prohibit extension of roads, infrastructure, services, or other development connections through the Harbor Terrace property to other non-Harbor District properties. This restrictions does not preclude trailhead connections.*
10. **Harbor Terrace Planning Criteria:** *Development plans for Harbor Terrace shall be evaluated according to the following criteria:*
  - a. **Priority of Uses:** *Proposed uses of the Harbor Terrace site shall include sufficient area for the highest priority coastal-dependent and coastal-related uses. To ensure that future development of the Harbor Terrace provides adequate facilities necessary to serve the highest priority uses and does not reduce opportunities for lower cost visitor serving uses and coastal access and recreation, future development shall provide the following:*
    1. **Minimum Required Uses:** *A minimum of 70 trailer boat storage spaces, 20 marine gear storage spaces, 48,000 square feet of general public parking (which includes public parking for a possible Harbor Office meeting room), and 10,000 square feet of expansion area that will be reserved to accommodate coastal-dependent and coastal-related uses. These uses shall be located in the western and southwestern portions of the site in order to maximize proximity to the coast and other associated harbor facilities, unless another location is equally sufficient.*
    2. **Prescribed Use Ratios:** *A minimum of one (1) lower-cost campsite (car or walk-in/bike-in tent campsite) must be provided for every one and a half (1.5) unit of hotel/motel (cabin, bungalow, inn, yurt, casita) development. A minimum of one (1) lower-cost campsite (car or walk-in/bike-in tent campsite) must be provided for every three (3) RV campsites.*
    3. **Project Phasing Limitations:** *Permits necessary to construct the minimum number of lower-cost campsites (car or walk-in/bike-in tent campsites) must be approved prior to or concurrently with any permit approval for hotel/motel and/or commercial retail development on the Harbor Terrace, and the lower-cost campsites must be available for use within one year of the opening of the hotel/motel and/or commercial retail development.*
    4. **Purpose of Commercial Uses:** *All commercial uses must serve coastal dependent uses, coastal-related uses and/or provide visitor-serving uses.*
    5. **Intent of Accommodations:** *With the exception of an on-site campground host or campground facilities manager, all overnight accommodations to be developed on the Harbor Terrace shall be exclusively available to the general public*

*for transient occupancy. The establishment or conversion of overnight accommodations to a private or members only use (e.g. timeshares or condominiums), or the implementation of any program to allow extended and exclusive use or occupancy of the facilities by an individual or limited group or segment of the public is prohibited.*

6. **Special Events:** *Specialized programs and temporary events are subject to land use approval consistent with the LCP. Outdoor events conducted on the site shall be planned and staged so that noise generated by the event, attendees, and traffic is minimized. Temporary events shall not interfere with harbor operations and boating and fishing activities.*

In addition to these standards, any project or alternative brought forward for review by the County of San Luis Obispo would be evaluated pursuant to Harbor Terrace building and site design standards, and standards in place to mitigate impacts to aesthetic resources, biological resources, cultural resources, and potential hazards.

### 5.2.3 Significant Impacts Resulting from the Proposed Project

Based on the analysis presented in Chapter 4 of this EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in the following potentially significant impacts:

1. **Aesthetic Resources.** Potential impacts to visual resources include silhouetting (commercial building), engineered appearance of terraces, potential visual clutter within the RV sites, changes in visual character, and the creation of new sources of lighting, affecting the dark night sky.
2. **Air Quality.** During construction of the project, generated emissions would potentially exceed SLOAPCD thresholds for ROG+NO<sub>x</sub> and DPM, and grading and construction activities would generate fugitive dust. Naturally occurring asbestos and materials containing asbestos may be encountered, and would require special handling. Operation of the project would generate emissions potentially exceeding ROG+NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and DPM emissions.
3. **Biological Resources.** Impacts to special-status terrestrial species and avian species (including nesting birds) may occur during construction. The project would temporarily and permanently affect native habitats including coastal scrub and introduced valley needlegrass grassland.
4. **Cultural Resources.** Grading and construction activities may affect previously undiscovered subsurface cultural resources.
5. **Geology and Soils.** Implementation of the project would require mass grading of the project site to remediate underlying geologic hazards including landslides, expansion, slope instability, and susceptibility to fault activity including groundshaking, rupture, and liquefaction. The potential for erosion and down-gradient sedimentation is high during construction. Long-term management of drainage is required to prevent over-saturation of the soil.

6. **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.** The project would generate GHG emissions and would contribute to climate change. Standard energy efficiency measures would be required.
7. **Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** Implementation of the project would require the proper handling, storage, transport, and disposal of contaminated soil. During construction, the use of equipment may result in an accidental spill or leak affecting sensitive resources and the public. The project is located within a high fire risk area.
8. **Transportation and Circulation.** The creation of additional trips and turning movements on Avila Beach Drive may warrant a left turn lane at one of the project entrances, which may result in secondary impacts to sensitive habitats and resources. Creation and maintenance of clear sight lines is required to avoid a potentially unsafe condition; this would include vegetation management and removal of parking areas near the intersection.

### **5.3 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS**

Criteria used to develop potential alternatives included the potential of the project to avoid impacts to sensitive resources and the human environment, whether or not it could generally meet the project objectives, and costs. Specific consideration was given to potential alternatives that appeared to avoid or minimize impacts to natural resources and the human environment, and are consistent with the San Luis Coastal Area Plan.

### **5.4 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS ANALYSIS**

#### **5.4.1 No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, the project would not be developed. Selection of this alternative would not preclude future development proposals, consistent with the San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan.

##### **5.4.1.1 Aesthetics**

Under the No Project Alternative, no physical improvements would occur. The site may continue to be used for storage and parking, and there would no requirement for visual mitigation including landscaping or screening.

##### **5.4.1.2 Air Quality, GHG, and Climate Change**

The No Project Alternative would not include any construction activities or long-term trip generation and, therefore, would not result in any adverse effects to air quality and GHG/climate change. This alternative would not result in GHG emissions or require the use of energy as nothing would be constructed.

##### **5.4.1.3 Biological Resources**

Biological resources would not be directly impacted by the No Project Alternative. The site would remain in its current state. The potential for sediment or pollutant discharge from existing uses would not be subject to mitigation including stormwater management, pollution control, or long-term slope stability measures.

#### **5.4.1.4 Cultural Resources**

No grading or development would occur; therefore, there would be no potential for discovery of unknown subsurface resources.

#### **5.4.1.5 Geology and Soils**

Under the No Project Alternative, mass grading, landslide remediation, and site development would not occur. The presence of existing landslides and a potentially active fault would remain a hazard for property stored onsite. No erosion control or stormwater management measures would be implemented.

#### **5.4.1.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The potential for additional fire risk would not occur under this alternative, because no campsites, commercial facilities, and supportive uses would be developed. The contaminated soil underlying the site would remain in place.

#### **5.4.1.7 Hydrology and Water Quality**

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would continue to generate unfiltered stormwater, which would percolate into the underlying soils (potentially increasing risk of landslide and slope instability), and would discharge offsite.

#### **5.4.1.8 Noise**

The potential for additional noise generation related to construction, additional traffic trips, and use of portable generators would not occur. Existing RVs on Avila Beach Drive may continue to generate noise as a result of generator use, potentially affecting adjacent beach areas.

#### **5.4.1.9 Public Services and Utilities**

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would not generate demand for water supply, wastewater treatment capacity, or energy usage. This would result in an additional 31.94 afy of surplus water (compared to the 100 afy allocation limit), and 9,968 gpd of surplus wastewater capacity (compared to the 70,000 gpd of capacity allocated for Port San Luis). However, neither surplus water nor surplus wastewater capacity may be available for non-district uses. Continued use of the site for storage may require emergency response including fire and police protection. Additionally, the removal of RV camping on Avila Beach Drive, as required in the San Luis Bay Area Plan, would negatively affect the Harbor District's ability to provide services, including public safety, for visitors due to the reduction in funding currently collected from these uses.

#### **5.4.1.10 Transportation and Circulation**

The No Project Alternative would not result in short- or long-term trip generation beyond existing conditions.

#### **5.4.1.11 Consistency with Project Objectives**

The No Project Alternative would not be consistent with project objectives, because it would not meet the primary goals of the project, which are to provide a range and mix of coastal related and visitor serving uses that enhance the public's enjoyment of the Port, serves the needs of harbor users, such that the land is financially and physically supportive of Harbor District operations and functions. Adoption of the No Project Alternative would constitute denial of the project.

## 5.4.2 Reduced Project Alternative

Under the Reduced Project Alternative, the number of hotel/motel units would be reduced to 20, and all units would be located in areas designated as ruderal/disturbed habitat. This modification is proposed to address potential impacts to biological resources, including avoidance of coastal scrub and valley needlegrass grassland habitats in the northern portion of the project site. Harbor use areas, including five marine gear storage spaces and four harbor use storage spaces would be relocated to the east of the proposed storage areas, to avoid impacts to coastal scrub. This alternative also includes a 20% reduction in RV spaces (resulting in 64 spaces total), which would reduce visual clutter, provide greater flexibility to site RV pads in less visual areas (set back from the terrace edges), and allow for more integration of landscaping features. 15 RV/RV cabins are included in this alternative. Implementation of this alternative would result in fewer medium to lower-cost options for overnight visitor accommodations in the Avila Beach/Port San Luis area. In addition, the provision of 64 RV spaces would result in an overall net loss of approximately 16 RV spaces in the Port San Luis Area (i.e. within the Port San Luis Master Plan Area), which may potentially conflict with Coastal Policies intended to increase public accessibility to the coastline and provide low-cost accommodations for visitors.

### 5.4.2.1 Aesthetics

Implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would further reduce potential visual impacts by reducing the number of structures and RV spaces on the project site. Eleven hotel/motel units located on the upper terrace would be removed, which would reduce potential visual clutter. RV pads would be redesigned to set spaces back farther from terrace edges, and additional space would be provided for interspersed landscaping and trees between pads. Mitigation identified in EIR Section 4.1 Aesthetic Resources would be required.

### 5.4.2.2 Air Quality, GHG, and Climate Change

Under this alternative, similar construction-related air quality and GHG/climate change impacts would occur. Operation impacts would be reduced due to a 35% reduction in trips generated by hotel/motel uses and 20% trip reduction for RV uses (as compared to the proposed project). GHG emissions would be reduced to 1,481.17 CO<sub>2</sub>e; however, this would still exceed the bright-line threshold and mitigation would be required, similar to the proposed project. Based on the amount of grading required to prepare the site for development consistent with the UBC and recommendations identified through geologic and geologic hazards review (refer to EIR Section 4.5 Geology and Soils), similar air quality impacts and GHG/climate change and mitigation measures would be required (refer to EIR Section 4.2 Air Quality).

### 5.4.2.3 Biological Resources

Under this alternative, structural development and storage area pads would be limited to areas considered ruderal/disturbed. Reducing the development of hotel/motel units and relocation of storage areas would avoid permanent impacts to 0.30 acre of coastal scrub and 0.08 acre of valley needlegrass grassland. Removal of eleven hotel/motel units would also reduce the extent of fuel modification and vegetation management within scrub and grassland habitats. Mitigation, including 2:1 replacement of habitat temporarily affected by grading and construction activities is recommended.

### 5.4.2.4 Public Services and Utilities

Under the Reduced Project Alternative, the project site would result in a lower demand for water supply and wastewater capacity. Water demand would be reduced by approximately 2.97 afy

and demand for wastewater capacity would be reduced by approximately 810 gpd; however, neither surplus water nor surplus wastewater capacity may be available for non-district uses. Energy demand would also decrease by 35% for the hotel units and 20% for the RV sites, compared to the proposed project. The demand for other services, including landfill capacity and police and fire protection would be similar to the proposed project.

#### **5.4.2.5 Transportation and Circulation**

The reduction in hotel/motel units and RV spaces would result in a reduction in traffic trips generated by the project. 20 hotel/motel units would generate approximately 164 daily trips, and 64 RV spaces would generate 173 daily trips. This alternative assumes that existing RV spaces on Avila Beach Drive would be accommodated onsite. Total trip generation would be reduced by approximately 133 trips, which equates to an approximately 11% reduction. This reduction would factor into further considerations regarding a left-turn lane at one of the project entrances; however, continued monitoring and coordination between County Public Works and the Harbor District is recommended.

#### **5.4.2.6 Other Issue Areas**

Implementation of this alternative would result in similar impacts to cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and noise.

#### **5.4.2.7 Consistency with Project Objectives**

The Reduced Project Alternative is generally consistent with project objectives. The reduction of higher-income generating uses including hotel/motel units and RV sites may affect the overall financial feasibility of the project, and may not support the objective that the project financially supports the Harbor District's public functions.

### **5.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

CEQA requires the alternatives section of an EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects identified in the EIR analysis while still attaining most of the basic project objectives. The alternative that most effectively reduces impacts while meeting project objectives should be considered the "environmentally superior alternative." In the event that the No Project Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR should identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

In this EIR, the No Project Alternative would result in the fewest environmental impacts; however, this alternative does not provide for the remediation of potential geologic hazards and improved management of stormwater runoff. The No Project Alternative does not meet the primary objectives of the project.

As proposed, and with incorporation of recommended mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in any significant, unavoidable environmental effects, and would meet project objectives. The proposed Reduced Project Alternative includes reductions in project development and avoidance of biological habitats to the maximum extent feasible. This alternative would further reduce impacts to aesthetic resources, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, transportation and traffic, and public services and utilities. Mitigation identified in the EIR would be required to address all potentially significant impacts, and to mitigate potential effects to less than significant levels, including impacts that would be reduced by implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative.

The Reduced Project Alternative may be found inconsistent with the following project objective: “provide a range and mix of uses, with emphasis on coastal related and visitor serving uses, including low and moderate cost overnight accommodations (campsites as stipulated in the LCP), so that the land is financially and physically supportive of Harbor District operations and functions”. In addition, development intent for Harbor Terrace is described in the San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan (pages 8-20) as, “The Harbor Terrace project will provide a range and mix of uses, with emphasis on coastal related and visitor serving uses, so that the land is financially and physically supportive of Harbor District operations.” The Reduced Project Alternative may not be found “financially and physically supportive of Harbor District operations and functions” and would not likely generate income for the Harbor District for the following reasons, which will be considered by the Harbor Commission and the County of San Luis Obispo (through review of the proposed CDP application):

- **Change in Net Income:** Annual net income (revenue net of operational expenses) derived from overnight accommodation uses (RV, RV-Cabin, Hotel/Motel, and Camping) is projected to total \$2,621,464 under the proposed project. Due to a decrease in RV spaces from 80 to 64 and a decrease in hotel/motel units from 31 to 20, annual net income derived from overnight accommodation uses under the Reduced Project Alternative is projected to total \$2,110,931. The Reduced Project Alternative therefore presents a loss of approximately \$510,532 annual net income as compared to the proposed project.
- **Change in Construction Cost:** Due to site configuration, location requirements of Harbor Uses prescribed in the San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan<sup>1</sup>, and balancing of AES-Impact 1 mitigation measures<sup>2</sup>, construction costs of the Reduced Project Alternative related to shifting of the Harbor Use areas out of coastal scrub habitat are not reduced as compared to the proposed project. It is possible the construction costs would increase as a result of added retaining walls required to accommodate the shift in Harbor Uses, but for the purpose of this analysis, it is conservatively assumed that no construction cost increase would occur. The decrease from 31 to 20 hotel/motel units would decrease construction costs by approximately \$295,000.
- **Change in Investment Return:** The loss of \$510,532 annual net income associated with the Reduced Project Alternative that is offset by a corresponding \$295,000 decrease in construction cost decreases the total project investment return by approximately 42%, from a 13.3% internal rate of return to a 7.8% return. The anticipated 7.8% return would render the project infeasible by normal standards of an investment risk-return profile.

<sup>1</sup> Location of the Harbor Uses on the site is somewhat restricted by the San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan (pg. 8-22 – 8-25): A minimum of 70 trailer boat storage spaces, 20 marine-gear storage spaces, 48,000 square feet of general parking (which includes public parking for a possible Harbor Office meeting room), and 10,000 square feet of expansion area that will be reserved to accommodate coastal-dependent and coastal-related uses. These uses shall be located in the western and southwestern portions of the site in order to maximize proximity to the coast and other associated harbor facilities, unless another location is equally sufficient.

<sup>2</sup> Mitigation Measure V-1 from the Port Master Plan states, “Grading shall be designed to conserve natural topographic features and appearances by means of land sculpting to blend graded slopes and benches with natural topography.” Mitigation Measure V-2 from the Port Master Plan states, “Construction equipment and staging areas for the development of the Harbor Terrace and Avila parking lot sites shall be stored and located in the least visually prominent location on site, and/or screened from public view.” The Northwest portion of the site is generally considered the least visually prominent location on site, as it is largely hidden from public viewpoints identified in the visual analysis of Chapter 4-1 of this EIR (due to the folding ridge pattern adjacent to Diablo Canyon Road).

Based strictly on an analysis of the relative environmental impacts, the Reduced Project Alternative, with adoption and incorporation of recommended mitigation measures, is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The County of San Luis Obispo will consider the whole of the record when considering the proposed Coastal Development Permit application, including but not limited to, public comment and testimony by the Harbor District, agencies, and the public. The County may select the project as proposed, an Alternative, or a specified combination of particular elements identified in the project and the Reduced Project Alternative, as the approved project. In all scenarios, the Mitigation and Monitoring Program would be applied to the approved project.

This page intentionally left blank.