

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

INTRODUCTION TO THE ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

As stipulated in Section 21002.1(a) of the CEQA Statutes (Public Resources Code):

The purpose of an environmental impact report is to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to a project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided.

More specifically, the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6) require an EIR to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the 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. The discussion of alternatives need not be exhaustive, but it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are deemed “infeasible.”

Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the 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 comparable merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.

Purpose

Section 15126.6(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment, the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which 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 project objectives, or would be more costly.

Selection of a Reasonable Range of Alternatives

Section 15126.6(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. 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. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. 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.

Level of Detail

The State CEQA Guidelines do not require the same level of detail in the alternatives analysis as in the analysis of the proposed project. Section 15126.6(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. A matrix displaying the major characteristics and significant environmental effects of each alternative may be used to summarize the comparison. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would result in the redevelopment and renovation of Camarillo Springs Golf Course, which has been developed, operational, and modified for more than 45 years. The current General Plan land use designation for the site is Public/Quasi-Public and the underlying zoning is RE (Rural Exclusive) and RE-1 Acre.

As discussed in the Environmental Impact Analysis section of this EIR, all potential environmental impacts of the proposed project would be reduced to less than significant levels through the mitigation measures recommended in this EIR. The proposed project would not result in any unavoidable significant impacts. As such, alternatives to the proposed project are not necessary to reduce or eliminate any unavoidable significant impacts.

Nevertheless, the alternatives to the proposed project that were considered for this EIR are described and evaluated in the following discussions.

No Project Alternative

As required by CEQA, a no project alternative is analyzed in this EIR section. Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that the no project alternative “analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published...as well as 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.” Furthermore, Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

If approval 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 result of the project’s non-approval and not create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment.

As discussed previously in this EIR, the current General Plan land use designation for the golf course is Public/Quasi-Public and the underlying zoning is RE and RE-1 Acre. The Conejo Creek area of the property is designated as a Waterway Linkage in the City of Camarillo General Plan Land Use Element and is zoned Open Space. Public uses permitted in these designations include parks, schools, libraries, police facilities and fire facilities. The quasi-public classification of the General Plan also permits those uses which are private in nature, but that serve the public needs. This includes such uses as hospitals, private educational institutions, religious institutions, and recreational uses such as golf courses.

The RE zone is a large lot residential zone with lots varying in size from 10,000 square feet to one acre or larger in size with a limited area used for mobile home parks. Pursuant to Section 19.12.030 of the Camarillo Municipal Code, uses permitted within the RE zone include the following:

- Agricultural uses. Land within the RE zone may be used for the growing of agricultural crops and uses ancillary thereto but no poultry or animals may be raised or kept on the lot or parcel except as otherwise permitted by this title and in accordance with the standards set forth herein;
- One-family dwelling of a permanent character placed in a permanent location;
- Day care, small family and large family;
- Elementary, junior high and high schools offering a full curriculum as required by state law but excluding boarding schools with private colleges being permitted under a conditional use permit;
- Farm animals and fowl subject to the limitations of conditions;
- Boarding and care of horses including accommodations and living quarters for groom and caretakers located within the same building when the parcel of land comprises ten acres or more;
- Fire stations, public buildings and other facilities of federal, state, county and city agencies, excluding detention facilities;
- Horticultural and floricultural of all types including nurseries, hothouses, greenhouses, orchards, flower and vegetable gardens, and accessory structures necessary for such use (excluding retail sales);
- Movie sets or locations which may contain structures of a temporary nature to be used for photographic purposes in connection with the production of motion pictures and television programs; provided, however, such sets or locations may not be used as a permanent studio or for other similar types of uses;
- Petroleum products storage required for agricultural uses on the premises; storage not to exceed one thousand gallons of petroleum products to be stored in a manner approved by the fire department and the community development department;
- Pigeons and small birds;
- Public parks, playgrounds and athletic fields.

Pursuant to Section 19.12.030 of the Camarillo Municipal Code, uses that are permitted within the RE zone with a conditional use permit include the following:

- Animals, fowl not otherwise permitted in this zone excluding livestock feeding pens;
- Boardinghouses and rest homes;

- Cemeteries, crematoriums and mausoleums;
- Churches;
- Commercial stables and riding academies;
- Community and publicly owned recreational centers, clubhouses and similarly used buildings and structures open to the public;
- Day care facilities for more children than allowed by right;
- Golf courses, tennis clubs, swim clubs, including clubhouse and accessory restaurant, pro shop, either publicly or privately owned but not including miniature golf courses;
- Public utility buildings and structures;
- Schools, colleges and boarding schools and similar establishments for education and training facilities and housing for the accommodating of faculty, students, trainees and other persons associated with such establishments when located on the same parcel or continuous parcels of land upon which a school or establishment is located;
- Natural resources, development of, including necessary structures and appurtenances;
- Mobilehome parks and mobilehome subdivisions;
- Temporary agricultural stands.

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed and the site would remain as a golf course. Under this scenario, none of the impacts evaluated in this EIR would occur. The golf course could continue to be operated in its current condition, it could be renovated or re-designed, or it could close.

A No Project alternative would not meet any of the objectives for the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would not abate existing flood hazards for current residents located immediately south of the project site, and would not provide the City with comprehensive flood safety infrastructure improvements. No new senior housing would be provided. No development in furtherance of the City's Housing Element would be taken, and no trails would be constructed or connected.

It is possible that a subsequent applicant could renovate, redesign, or redevelop the golf course within the existing limits of the golf course or expand the golf course within the existing property boundaries. It is also possible that another application could be submitted to the City of Camarillo in the near future requesting approval to redevelop the site with uses to the extent permitted by the existing RE and RE-1 Acre zones and General Plan land use designation of Public/Quasi-Public. This could include the uses described above. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not preclude development of the project

site; it may instead temporarily delay to a later date the redevelopment of the site with a potential range of new uses. Redevelopment consistent with the underlying existing zoning could create greater impacts associated with traffic, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, public services, and utilities if the site is developed with uses that are more intensive than the proposed project (e.g., an educational institution, a hospital, public agency offices, active athletic fields, etc.). If such development eliminates the golf course altogether, such development would likely result in greater biological resources impacts than the proposed project, which retains a substantial portion of the golf course.

While the No Project Alternative would delay, but may not eliminate or reduce, the less than significant environmental impact associated with the proposed project, it is speculative and beyond the scope of this EIR to evaluate the potential development of the site under every use that is permitted in the RE and RE-1 Acre zones. Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the existing golf course would continue to operate in its existing condition, which would result in fewer impacts than the proposed project. However, because the proposed project does not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, the No Project Alternative would not serve to eliminate or reduce a significant and unavoidable impact, even under this assumption.

Reduced Density Alternative

The proposed project involves a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to change the land use designation for a 31-acre portion of the property to Low-Medium Density Residential (5.1 - 10 dwelling units per acre). The Reduced Density Alternative would involve a GPA to change the land use designation for the same 31-acre portion of the property to Low Density Residential (5 dwelling units per acre max). This would result in the development of up to 150 new age-restricted (55+) residential units.

This alternative would not include renovations to the existing golf course and would not remove the existing homes south of the project site from the 100-year floodplain, as these improvements are proposed to be funded through revenues generated by the proposed project's 248 residential units. Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the new residential development area would be raised above the base flood elevation and the existing residences outside the project site would remain in the flood hazard zone. This alternative may reduce the amount of grading necessary as the excavation depth in the southern golf course area could be shallower and no grading would occur elsewhere within the golf course.

The following compares the potential impacts of this Reduced Density Alternative to those of the proposed project:

Aesthetics and Visual Resources: The aesthetic characteristics of the Reduced Density Alternative residential area would be similar to those of the proposed project. This alternative would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. It would not permanently change any scenic resources designated for agriculture, open space, historic sites, or waterways to urban uses and it would not conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality. This alternative could create a new

source of substantial light or glare but it would be subject to the same light-shielding requirements and mitigation measures as the proposed project. The primary aesthetic impact of this alternative would be the potential degradation of the golf course if it is not improved or no longer maintained; however, that would be speculative. This would be a negative aesthetic effect on the existing residences that surround the golf course as well as the new residents of this alternative.

Air Quality: This alternative would generate fewer construction-related emissions than the proposed project since there would be less grading and fewer operational emissions as there would be fewer new residences and associated vehicle trips. However, the proposed project's air quality impacts are also less than significant with mitigation.

Biological Resources: This alternative would affect fewer sensitive biological resources and, therefore, have slightly lower impacts than the proposed project since there would be less grading in the southern golf course area and no grading elsewhere within the golf course. However, the proposed project's biological resources impacts are also less than significant with mitigation.

Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources: This alternative would have the same potential to disturb previously undiscovered archaeological resources (unanticipated discoveries) during grading as the proposed project and would be subject to the same mitigation measures as the proposed project. However, the proposed project's cultural resources impacts are also less than significant with mitigation.

Energy: This alternative would require less energy during both construction and operation due to less grading and construction activity and fewer new residences. However, the proposed project's energy impacts are also less than significant.

Geology and Soils: The impacts associated with the development of this alternative are the same as those associated with the proposed project. This alternative would be subject to the same mitigation for the protection of previously undiscovered paleontological resources as the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: This alternative would generate fewer construction-related GHG emissions since there would be less grading and fewer operational GHG emissions as there would be fewer new residences and associated vehicle trips. However, the proposed project's greenhouse gas emissions impacts are also less than significant.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The impacts associated with the development of this alternative are the same as those associated with the proposed project although this project may have nominally less potential to release hazardous materials during site grading since there would be less grading in the southern golf course area and no grading elsewhere within the golf course. This alternative would be subject to the same mitigation for the prevention of hazardous materials releases as the proposed project. However, the proposed project's hazards and hazardous materials-related impacts are also less than significant with mitigation.

Hydrology and Water Quality: The impacts associated with development of this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project. This alternative would be subject to the same regulations for the control and treatment of water during construction and operation as the proposed project. The new residential development area would be raised above the base flood elevation. However, the existing residences would remain in the flood hazard zone. Thus, this alternative would result in similar impacts, but would not provide the same hydrology and flooding-related benefits as the proposed project.

Land Use and Planning: The impacts associated with the development of this alternative are the same as those associated with the proposed project. Like the proposed project, this alternative would require approval of a General Plan Amendment and change of zone.

Noise and Vibration: This alternative would generate less construction-related noise and vibration levels since there would be less grading in the southern golf course area and no grading elsewhere within the golf course, and less operational noise levels since there would be fewer new residences and associated vehicle trips. However, the proposed project's noise impacts are also less than significant.

Population and Housing: This alternative would generate a smaller number of new residents (approximately 300) than the proposed project. However, this alternative would result in the same less than significant impacts to population and housing as the proposed project.

Public Services and Recreation: This alternative would generate less demand for public services and recreational amenities than the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be slightly less than the proposed project. However, the proposed project's public services and recreational impacts are also less than significant.

Transportation: This alternative would result in similar transportation impacts as the proposed project. While this alternative would generate fewer traffic trips since there would be fewer new residences, vehicle miles traveled per capita would likely be the same, as overall the project would have fewer residents.

Utilities and Service Systems: This alternative would generate less demand for public utilities and service systems than the proposed project and therefore would have slightly less impact than the proposed project. However, the proposed project's utilities and service systems impacts are also less than significant.

Wildfire: In general, the risk to wildfire of the new residential uses under this alternative would be the same as the proposed project. However, the risk to these new uses as well as the existing residences in the area may worsen if the golf course is not improved or no longer maintained.

Development of the Reduced Density Alternative could meet the following objectives for the project:

- Assist the City in implementing the General Plan's housing goals by increasing the City's housing stock and diversifying the range of housing opportunities for a special needs population (seniors) in an area adjacent to existing, established residential communities. However, because this alternative would provide substantially fewer dwelling units than the proposed project, this objective would be met to a substantially lesser degree.
- Provide a mix of high-quality housing to accommodate the City's growing senior population. However, because this alternative would provide substantially fewer units, this objective would also be met to a lesser degree.
- Develop a residential planned development that will make available a variety of housing designs and facilitate the use of innovative approaches to housing design thereby supporting the City's General Plan Housing Element goals and policies. However, because this alternative would provide substantially fewer units, this objective would be met to a lesser degree.
- Design a residential infill community that respects the privacy of adjacent residents through the utilization of setbacks and landscaped buffers.
- Utilize sustainable design measures to reduce water usage, lower residential energy consumption, maximize energy saving features, and protect natural resources consistent with the City's land use goals and policies.

This alternative would not meet the following objectives for the project:

- Abate existing flood hazards for those current residents living in a special flood hazard zone designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
- Implement comprehensive flood safety infrastructure improvements at no cost to existing residents or the City of Camarillo.
- Renovate an existing privately-owned golf course to address changing demands for golf alongside interrelated recreational amenities, thereby supporting the City's General Plan Recreation Element goals and policies.
- Create opportunities for future and existing residents to socialize, dine, and recreate through the preservation and enhancement of golf and associated amenities, including a renovated clubhouse.
- Enhance neighborhood walkability and connect existing and proposed residential communities to parks and recreational amenities through a network of trails, internal walkways, and paseos to be used by existing and proposed residents.

- Implement timely public facilities such as utilities, roads, and recreational amenities as development occurs within existing service areas without burden or cost to existing residents, visitors or the City of Camarillo.

Reduced Intensity Alternative

This alternative would develop new residential units consistent with the same Low-Medium Density Residential (5.1 - 10 dwelling units per acre) designation as the proposed project but would cover an area of 15 acres rather than the 31 acres of the proposed project. This alternative would result in the development of up to 150 new age-restricted (55+) residential units.

For the same reasons discussed above for the Reduced Density Alternative, this alternative would not include renovations to the existing golf course and would not remove the existing homes south of the project site from the 100-year floodplain, as these improvements are proposed to be funded through revenues generated by the proposed project's 248 dwelling units. Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, the new residential development area would be raised above the base flood elevation and the existing offsite residences would remain in the flood hazard zone. This alternative would reduce the amount of grading necessary as the excavation depth in the southern golf course area could be shallower and no grading would occur elsewhere within the golf course.

The following discussions compare the potential impacts of this Reduced Intensity Alternative to those of the proposed project:

Aesthetics and Visual Resources: The aesthetic characteristics of the Reduced Intensity Alternative residential area would be similar to those of the proposed project. This alternative would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. It would not permanently change any scenic resources designated for agriculture, open space, historic sites, or waterways to urban uses and it would not conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality. This alternative could create a new source of substantial light or glare but it would be subject to the same light-shielding requirements and mitigation measures as the proposed project. The primary aesthetic effect of this alternative would be the potential degradation of the golf course if it is not improved or no longer maintained; however, given the current operations of the golf course that would be speculative. Should this occur, however, this would be a negative aesthetic effect on the existing residences that surround the golf course as well as the new residents of this alternative.

Air Quality: This alternative would generate fewer construction-related emissions than the proposed project since there would be less grading, and fewer operational emissions as there would be fewer new residences and associated vehicle trips. However, the proposed project's air quality impacts are also less than significant with mitigation.

Biological Resources: This alternative would affect fewer sensitive biological resources and, therefore, have slightly lower impacts than the proposed project since there would be less grading in the southern golf course area and no grading elsewhere within the golf course. However, the proposed project's biological resources impacts are also less than significant with mitigation.

Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources: This alternative would have the same potential to disturb previously undiscovered archaeological resources (unanticipated discoveries) during grading as the proposed project and would be subject to the same mitigation measures as the proposed project. However, the proposed project's cultural resources impacts are also less than significant with mitigation.

Energy: This alternative would require less energy during both construction and operation due to less grading and construction activity and fewer new residences. However, the proposed project's energy impacts are also less than significant.

Geology and Soils: The impacts associated with the development of this alternative are the same as those associated with the proposed project. This alternative would be subject to the same mitigation for the protection of previously undiscovered paleontological resources as the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: This alternative would generate fewer construction-related GHG emissions since there would be less grading, and fewer operational GHG emissions since there would be fewer new residences and associated vehicle trips. However, the proposed project's greenhouse gas emissions impacts are also less than significant.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The impacts associated with the development of this alternative are the same as those associated with the proposed project although this project may have nominally less potential to release hazardous materials during site grading since there would be less grading in the southern golf course area and no grading elsewhere within the golf course. This alternative would be subject to the same mitigation for the prevention of hazardous materials releases as the proposed project. However, the proposed project's hazards and hazardous materials-related impacts are also less than significant with mitigation.

Hydrology and Water Quality: The impacts associated with development of this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project. This alternative would be subject to the same regulations for the control and treatment of water during construction and operation as the proposed project. The new residential development area would be raised above the base flood elevation. However, the existing residences would remain in the flood hazard zone. Thus, this alternative would result in similar impacts, but would not provide the same hydrology and flooding-related benefits as the proposed project.

Land Use and Planning: The impacts associated with the development of this alternative are the same as those associated with the proposed project. Like the proposed project, this alternative would require approval of a General Plan Amendment and change of zone.

Noise and Vibration: This alternative would generate less construction-related noise and vibration levels since there would be less grading in the southern golf course area and no grading elsewhere within the golf course, and less operational noise levels since there would be fewer new residences and associated vehicle trips. However, the proposed project's noise impacts are also less than significant.

Population and Housing: This alternative would generate a smaller number of new residents (approximately 300) than the proposed project. However, this alternative would result in the same less than significant impacts to population and housing as the proposed project.

Public Services and Recreation: This alternative would generate less demand for public services than the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be slightly less than the proposed project. However, the proposed project's public services and recreational impacts are also less than significant.

Transportation: This alternative would result in similar transportation impacts as the proposed project. While this alternative would generate fewer traffic trips since there would be fewer new residences, vehicle miles traveled per capita would likely be the same, as overall the project would have fewer residents.

Utilities and Service Systems: This alternative would generate less demand for public utilities and service systems than the proposed project and, therefore, would have slightly less impact than the proposed project. However, the proposed project's utilities and service systems impacts are also less than significant.

Wildfire: In general, the risk to wildfire of the new residential uses under this alternative would be the same as the proposed project. However, the risk to these new uses as well as the existing residences in the area may worsen if the golf course is not improved or no longer maintained.

Development of the Reduced Intensity Alternative could meet the following objectives for the project:

- Assist the City in implementing the General Plan's housing goals by increasing the City's housing stock and diversifying the range of housing opportunities for a special needs population (seniors) in an area adjacent to existing, established residential communities. However, because this alternative would provide significantly fewer dwelling units than the proposed project, this objective would be met to a significantly lesser degree.
- Provide a mix of high-quality housing to accommodate the City's growing senior population. However, because this alternative would provide significantly fewer units, this objective would also be met to a lesser degree.
- Develop a residential planned development that will make available a variety of housing designs and facilitate the use of innovative approaches to housing design thereby supporting the City's General Plan

Housing Element goals and policies. However, because this alternative would provide significantly fewer units, this objective would be met to a lesser degree.

- Design a residential infill community that respects the privacy of adjacent residents through the utilization of setbacks and landscaped buffers.
- Utilize sustainable design measures to reduce water usage, lower residential energy consumption, maximize energy saving features, and protect natural resources consistent with the City's land use goals and policies.

This alternative would not meet the following objectives for the project:

- Abate existing flood hazards for those current residents living in a special flood hazard zone designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
- Implement comprehensive flood safety infrastructure improvements at no cost to existing residents or the City of Camarillo.
- Renovate an existing privately-owned golf course to address changing demands for golf alongside interrelated recreational amenities, thereby supporting the City's General Plan Recreation Element goals and policies.
- Create opportunities for future and existing residents to socialize, dine, and recreate through the preservation and enhancement of golf and associated amenities, including a renovated clubhouse.
- Enhance neighborhood walkability and connect existing and proposed residential communities to parks and recreational amenities through a network of trails, internal walkways, and paseos to be used by existing and proposed residents.
- Implement timely public facilities such as utilities, roads, and recreational amenities as development occurs within existing service areas without burden or cost to existing residents, visitors or the City of Camarillo.

Alternative Site

The evaluation of an alternative site is generally practical for new infrastructure projects or other projects that do not need to be developed at a site that is owned by a particular project developer. It is generally less applicable to new infill general development projects such as the proposed project. In the case of this proposed project, the project applicant could, in theory, purchase another property within Camarillo that is designated for residential uses. However, there are no sites available within the City that are similar in size to the project site, or that include an existing private golf course amenity that could be renovated and integrated into the proposed residential component of the project. Further, several of the project objectives are site-specific, including those relating to the flood hazard abatement portions of the project. As stated

above, the proposed project does not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, therefore moving the project to a different alternative site would not avoid or reduce any unavoidable significant impact. For those impacts that are less than significant, moving the project to an alternative would not appreciably reduce the potential for these impacts, unless the alternative site were already substantially disturbed and therefore had substantially fewer biological resources within the portions of the site that would be subject to grading and development. However, as discussed above, there are no similarly-sized sites available with the City, regardless of whether the sites are already disturbed or in their natural state. Thus, the Alternative Site Alternative would likely not reduce any of the project's impacts.

Further, development at an alternative site would not meet the following objectives for the project:

- Abate existing flood hazards for those current residents living in a special flood hazard zone designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
- Implement comprehensive flood safety infrastructure improvements at no cost to existing residents or the City of Camarillo.
- Renovate an existing privately-owned golf course to address changing demands for golf alongside interrelated recreational amenities, thereby supporting the City's General Plan Recreation Element goals and policies.
- Create opportunities for future and existing residents to socialize, dine, and recreate through the preservation and enhancement of golf and associated amenities, including a renovated clubhouse.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of a proposed project and the alternatives, Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an "environmentally superior" alternative be selected and the reasons for such a selection disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least amount of adverse impacts. In this case, No Project Alternative would result in the least impacts on the existing environment. However, where the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA directs agencies to identify a second environmentally superior alternative. Here, the proposed project will not result in any significant unavoidable environmental impacts. However, both the Reduced Density Alternative and the Reduced Intensity Alternative may incrementally reduce the project's already less than significant impacts even further. However, these alternatives would not meet many of the project objectives, or would meet some of the project objectives to a substantially lesser degree than the proposed project, and would not provide the flood control benefits that would be realized by the proposed project.