6.0 ALTERNATIVES

As required by Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, this EIR examines alternatives to the on-site development analyzed in this document. Included in this analysis are two alternatives, including the CEQA-required "no project" alternative. This section also identifies alternatives that were considered, but rejected, as well as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

The following alternatives are evaluated in this EIR:

- *Alternative 1: No Project*
- *Alternative 2: Reduced Building Area Alternative*

Table 6-1 provides a summary comparison of the development characteristics of the alternatives. A more detailed description of the alternatives is included in the impact analysis for each alternative.

Table 6-1
Comparison of Project Alternatives' Buildout Characteristics

Characteristic	Proposed Project	Alternatives	
		No Project	Reduced Building Area Alternative
Number of Residences	31	0	31
Maximum Living Area Allowed per Lot	4,000 sf	Not applicable	2,500 sf
Maximum Grading Quantity Allowed per Lot	1,000 cubic yards	Not applicable	500 cubic yards
Total Daily Traffic Trips	297	0	297

sf = square feet

6.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

6.1.1 Alternative Description

This alternative assumes that the Landslide Moratorium Ordinance revisions would not be adopted and that the 31 vacant parcels would not be developed, and they would remain in their current condition.

6.1.2 Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

This alternative would result in 31 fewer new residential units constructed in the Zone 2 area compared to the proposed project. As such, the No Project alternative would have no new impacts to scenic vistas, visual character, and light and glare. The potential aesthetic impacts of the proposed project would be avoided under this alternative. Because this alternative would have no impact to aesthetics, mitigation would not be required.

Air Quality

This alternative would result in no short-term construction emissions or long-term operational emissions because no new residences would be constructed. The construction and operational emissions of the proposed project would be avoided under this alternative, as would the potential impacts to air quality from these emissions. This alternative would have no impact on air quality. Because this alternative would have no impact to air quality, mitigation would not be required.

Biological Resources

The No Project alternative would involve no alteration of land and disturbance of vegetation because the Landslide Moratorium Ordinance revisions would not be adopted and no new residences would be constructed. Therefore, this alternative would not impact existing vegetation, wildlife habitat, wetlands, trees, or other sensitive biological resources. The No Project alternative would not conflict with adopted habitat-related plans. This alternative would avoid the potential biological impacts of the proposed project, and it would have no impacts. Mitigation would not be required for this alternative.

Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources

This alternative would not result in grading, excavation, or other ground disturbance. The ground disturbance and resultant potential to impact cultural resources associated with development of the 31 residences under the proposed project would be avoided. The No Project Alternative would have no impact, which would be less than under the proposed project. Mitigation would not be required for this alternative.

Geology

This alternative assumes that the Landslide Moratorium Ordinance revisions would not be adopted and that the 31 vacant parcels would not be developed, and they would remain in their current condition. Because the lots would not be developed with residences, this alternative would not expose new structures or people to slope failure or seismically induced groundshaking.

Because this alternative would not involve construction activities or ground disturbance, the potential for accelerated erosion would be avoided. In addition, because development under this alternative would not occur, there would be no increase in the amount of impermeable surface in the project area. Therefore, adverse impacts from increased or accelerated surface drainage, such as downstream erosion or slope failures, would be avoided. This alternative

would have no impacts to geology and soils, and would avoid the potential impacts of the proposed project. Mitigation would not be required for the No Project alternative.

Greenhouse Gases

This alternative would result in no short-term construction or long-term operational GHG emissions because no new residences would be constructed. The construction and operational GHG emissions of the proposed project would be avoided under this alternative, as would the potential impacts to climate change from these emissions. This alternative would have no impact on climate change or GHG emissions. Because this alternative would have no impact to GHG or climate change, mitigation would not be required.

Fire Protection

This alternative assumes that the Landslide Moratorium Ordinance revisions would not be adopted and that the 31 vacant or underdeveloped parcels would remain in their current condition and would not be developed. Because the lots would not be developed with residences, this alternative would not expose new structures or people to risk of wildland fire. Compared to the proposed project, the No Project alternative would have reduced impacts. Because there would be no impact, mitigation would not be required for this alternative.

Hydrology, Water Quality and Water Availability

Because this alternative would not involve construction activities or ground disturbance, the potential for accelerated erosion and resultant sedimentation of surface waters would be avoided. In addition, because development under this alternative would not occur, there would be no increase in the amount of impermeable surface in the project area. Therefore, adverse impacts from increased or accelerated surface drainage, such as downstream erosion or slope failures, would be avoided. Additionally, because there would be no increase in impervious surface area, the potential for stormwater runoff and precipitation to infiltrate soils would not be reduced. This alternative would have no adverse impacts to hydrology and water quality and would avoid the potential impacts of the proposed project. Mitigation would not be required for the No Project alternative. On the other hand, existing drainage deficiencies in the area would not be addressed under this alternative.

Noise

Temporary noise and vibration impacts due to construction activities under the proposed project would be avoided under this alternative because there would be no new residences constructed. Because there would no new residences constructed, there would be no new on-site uses or increase of traffic of vehicle trips. Therefore, the long-term noise impacts associated with traffic under the proposed project would be avoided under this alternative. The No Project alternative would have no impacts related to noise. This alternative would not require mitigation.

Transportation and Circulation

This alternative assumes that the Landslide Moratorium Ordinance revisions would not be adopted and that the 31 vacant or underdeveloped parcels would remain in their current condition and would not be developed. Because the lots would not be developed with

residences, this alternative would not generate new vehicle trips or traffic delay. The No Project Alternative would have no impacts and would avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project. Because this alternative would have no impacts on transportation and circulation, mitigation would not be required.

Utilities

This alternative assumes that the Landslide Moratorium Ordinance revisions would not be adopted and that the 31 vacant parcels would remain in their current condition and would not be developed. Because the lots would not be developed with residences, this alternative would not generate new demand for utilities or service systems, such as sewer and wastewater conveyance facilities. The No Project Alternative would have no impact and would avoid the potentially significant, but mitigable impacts of the proposed project. Because the No Project Alternative would have no impacts, mitigation would not be required.

6.2 REDUCED BUILDING AREA ALTERNATIVE

6.2.1 Alternative Description

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative assumes that the proposed ordinance revisions would potentially allow up to 31 LME requests, which would permit individual property owners to then apply for individual entitlements to develop their lots. However, under this alternative, the ordinance revisions would further restrict allowable development on each lot so that the overall building area would be reduced by approximately 38%. Development assumptions for this alternative would include the following:

- *Thirty-one single-story, ranch-style residences with attached or detached three-car garages, with minimum living area of 1,500 square feet and maximum living area of 2,500 square feet or 15% of gross lot area, whichever is less;*
- *Less than 500 cubic yards of grading (cut and fill combined) per lot, with no more than 50 cubic yards of imported fill and up to 1,000 cubic yards of export per lot;*
- *Maximum 25% (RS-1) or 40% (RS-2) net lot coverage;*
- *Maximum building height of 16 feet for residences and 12 feet for detached accessory structures;*
- *Minimum front setbacks of 20 feet, minimum rear setbacks of 15 feet, minimum street-side setbacks of 10 feet, and minimum interior side setbacks of 5 feet, with setbacks along private street rights-of-way measured from the easement line rather than the property line; and,*
- *No subdivision of existing lots within Zone 2.*

6.2.2 Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

Although this alternative would result in the same number of residential units as the proposed project (31 total), the maximum allowed building size for each lot (2,500 square feet) under this alternative would be reduced by approximately 38% compared to the proposed project (maximum of 4,000 square feet). As such, the Reduced Building Area Alternative would have

incrementally fewer impacts to scenic vistas, visual character, and light and glare than the proposed project. Nevertheless, like the proposed project, impacts related to visual character and light and glare would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures AES-3 and AES-4. In addition, although this alternative would have less overall building area, the development of 31 new residential units in the project area could involve the removal of mature trees and vegetation like the proposed project. Therefore, as with the proposed project, Mitigation Measure AES-2 would apply to this alternative in order to avoid removal of or substantial damage to existing trees and/or to replace trees that are removed. As with the proposed project, with this mitigation measure, impacts to scenic resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Air Quality

The duration of construction activities would be incrementally shorter under this alternative since the overall building area would be reduced by approximately 38% compared to the proposed project. In addition, the amount of grading would be reduced under this alternative since up to only 500 cubic yards of grading would be allowed compared to the proposed project which would allow up to 1,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill per lot. However, because maximum daily construction emissions would be generally the same under this alternative, temporary air quality impacts during construction would be similar to those resulting from the proposed project. Thus, as with the proposed project, temporary construction impacts would be less than significant.

Although transportation emissions would be similar under this alternative to the proposed project since the overall number of new residences and vehicle trips would be the same, long-term air quality impacts would be incrementally lower since smaller building areas for each lot would generate fewer emissions associated with energy (electricity and natural gas). As with the proposed project, the emissions associated with vehicle trips and stationary emissions under this alternative would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds and long-term air quality impacts would be less than significant. Further, like the proposed project, this alternative would not create carbon monoxide concentrations that would exceed any state or federal standards with implementation of mitigation measures T-1(a-e) in Section 4.10, Traffic and Circulation. In addition, this alternative would not exceed any population projections upon which the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) are based. Thus, as with the proposed project, impacts from this alternative related to carbon monoxide and consistency with the AQMP would be less than significant.

Biological Resources

Although this alternative would result in the same number of residential units as the proposed project (31 total), the total building area of each lot (maximum of 2,500 square feet) under this alternative would be reduced by approximately 38% compared to the proposed project (maximum of 4,000 square feet). Thus, the area that would be disturbed on each lot as well as required fire clearance would be reduced, and the Reduced Building Area alternative would have incrementally fewer impacts to sensitive status species. In addition, like the proposed project, this alternative would not conflict with local policies related to protecting biological resources and would not conflict with any adopted habitat-related plans.

Although this alternative would have less overall building area, the development of up to 31 new residential units in the project area could have an impact on existing or regrown Coastal Sage Scrub habitat, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, as with the proposed project, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would apply to this alternative in order to reduce impacts to possible stands of CSS vegetation and to maintain consistency with the NCCP Subarea Plan and local ordinances. In addition, because this alternative would involve development on lots near Altamira Canyon, like the proposed project, development of these lots may affect jurisdictional areas. Mitigation measures BIO-3(a-b) would be required to reduce impacts related to jurisdictional drainages near Altamira Canyon. Furthermore, although this alternative would likely result in removal of fewer trees than the proposed project since the overall building area would be reduced under this alternative, tree removal associated with construction activities under this alternative could affect nesting birds. As with the proposed project, with Mitigation Measure BIO-4, impacts to nesting birds would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources

Although this alternative would result in less overall building area compared to the proposed project, activities associated with construction of this alternative could similarly expose previously unknown, buried archaeological resources. Mitigation Measure CR-1 would be required under this alternative and would reduce this alternative's impacts to archaeological resources to a less than significant level. This alternative would result in a reduction in the amount of grading in the project area since only 500 cubic yards of grading would be allowed under this alternative compared to the proposed project which would allow up to 1,000 cubic yards of combined cut/fill per lot. Thus, this alternative would have incrementally fewer impacts related to the potential to disturb paleontological resources and/or human remains. As with the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant.

Geology

Although the overall building area under this alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed project, the new structures and people in the project area under this alternative could be exposed to seismically induced groundshaking. Nevertheless, as with the proposed project, mandatory compliance with applicable CBC requirements would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Because this alternative would reduce the overall building area and incrementally reduce the overall amount of impermeable surface compared to the proposed project, the potential to cause or accelerate erosion, such that slope failure could occur or potentially cause or accelerate downstream erosion, would be incrementally reduced under this alternative. However, during construction of individual lots, topsoil would be exposed and potentially removed from individual properties which, like the proposed project, could cause accelerated erosion in the project area. In addition, because development under this alternative would increase the amount of impermeable surface in the project area compared to existing conditions, adverse surface drainage could cause or accelerate erosion, which could undermine proposed structures and lead to surficial slope failures on either manufactured or natural slopes. Therefore, like the proposed project, Mitigation Measure HWQ-1, as identified in Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, would be required to reduce erosion during construction to a less than significant level and Mitigation Measure HWQ-4 in Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, would be required to reduce impacts related to erosion during the operational phase of this alternative. As with the

proposed project, with implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts related to erosion during both the construction and operational phase of this alternative would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Although this alternative would result in less overall building area than the proposed project, like the proposed project, the project area is located on a geologic unit that could be unstable or could potentially become unstable as a result of development facilitated by this alternative. In addition, the project area is also located in an area subject to earthquake induced landslides and the potential for expansive soils. Therefore as with the proposed project, mitigation measure GEO-3(a) and GEO-3(b) would be required to reduce impacts related to soil instability, landslides and expansive soils to below a level of significance under CEQA.

As with the proposed project, because the project area is not susceptible to liquefaction, ground lurching, lateral spreading or seismic settlement, this alternative would also result in less than significant impacts related to these issues.

Greenhouse Gases

Since this alternative would result in approximately 38% less building area compared to the proposed project, greenhouse gas emissions associated with construction, energy, area sources, water use, and solid waste would be incrementally reduced in comparison. Transportation emissions would be the same as the proposed project since both would provide 31 single-family residences within the project area. Nevertheless, because the total building area would be reduced under this alternative, this alternative would have incrementally fewer greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, like the proposed project, this alternative would be consistent with the GHG reduction strategies set forth by the City's ERAP, the SCAG RTP/SCS. The proposed project would also be consistent with the CARB 2017 Scoping Plan. Therefore, as with the proposed project, impacts to greenhouse gas emissions under this alternative would be less than significant.

Fire Protection

Although the overall building area under this alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed project, the new structures under this alternative would be subject to the same potential fire hazards as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the residential structures under this alternative would be located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Thus, as with the proposed project, new residences constructed as a result of adoption of this alternative could expose people or structures to risks associated with wildland fires. Therefore, this alternative, like the proposed project, would be required to implement mitigation measures FIRE-1(a) and FIRE-1(b) in order to reduce fire hazard impacts to a less than significant level.

Hydrology, Water Quality and Water Availability

Because this alternative would have less overall building area compared to the proposed project, this alternative would have incrementally fewer impacts related to water quality during construction activities compared to the proposed project. However, excavation and grading for each of the individual residential units developed under this alternative, like the proposed project, could result in erosion of soils and sedimentation, which may cause temporary impacts to surface water quality. Consequently, as with the proposed project, implementation of

Mitigation Measure HWQ-1, which would require each applicant to prepare a Construction Erosion Control and Water Quality Plan, would be required for this alternative in order to reduce impacts related to water quality during construction activities to a less than significant level.

For operational impacts, the building footprint under this alternative would be reduced by approximately 38% compared to the proposed project. On the other hand, the total amount of new landscaping under this alternative could be incrementally increased compared to the proposed project, thereby increasing the amount of pollutants such as pesticides and herbicides that could potentially affect surface water quality. As with the proposed project, impacts related to operational surface water quality would be significant but mitigable with implementation of Mitigation Measure HWQ-2. Impacts related to groundwater recharge would be less than significant, similar to those of the proposed project.

Although the amount of impermeable surface would be reduced under this alternative compared to the proposed project, like the proposed project, this alternative would develop on sites that are currently vacant; therefore, this alternative would increase the amount of impermeable surface in the project area which may increase storm water flows and create localized flooding. In addition, because several of the single-family homes under this alternative could be constructed in an area in which there is a potential for flood hazards to exist, flooding could occur, which could cause damage to structures and could be hazardous to humans during a storm event. Impacts related to localized flooding and to the potential for flood hazards, like the proposed project, would be potentially significant. Consequently, as with the proposed project, mitigation measures HWQ-3 and HWQ-5 would be required for this alternative to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Noise

Temporary noise and vibration impacts due to construction activities under this alternative would be generally similar to those resulting from the anticipated development as the construction equipment used on-site would be similar. As with the proposed project, compliance with the Rancho Palos Verdes Municipal Code's restrictions on the hours and days of construction, would reduce temporary vibration impacts and noise impacts related to construction to less than significant levels.

Long-term traffic-generated noise impacts under this alternative would be the same as the proposed project since this alternative would result in the same number of vehicle trips as the proposed project. As with anticipated on-site development, noise generated by traffic would be less than significant under this alternative.

Transportation and Circulation

This alternative would reduce the overall building area compared to the proposed project. However, like the proposed project, this alternative includes 31 residential units. Therefore, this alternative would result in the same number of vehicle trips in the AM and PM peak period as the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have the same impacts as the proposed project including significant impacts at the following intersections:

- *Hawthorne Boulevard/Via Rivera*
- *Seahill Drive-Tramonto Drive/Palos Verdes Drive South*
- *Narcissa Drive/Palos Verdes Drive South*
- *Forrestal Drive/Palos Verdes Drive South*
- *Palos Verdes Drive East/Palos Verdes Drive South*

Therefore, this alternative would be required to implement mitigation measures T-1(a-e) in order to reduce significant impacts. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Because overall vehicle trips would be the same under this alternative as under the proposed project, impacts related to roadway segments, CMP identified freeway monitoring segments and arterial intersections, emergency access, and public transportation policies would also be the same as the proposed project. Impacts related to CMP identified freeway monitoring segments and arterial intersections, emergency access, and public transportation policies would be less than significant. However, as with the proposed project, impacts related to the studied Palos Verdes Drive South east of Narcissa Drive segment would not meet the City's minimum LOS D standard under the Year 2030 future pre-project and Year 2030 future with project conditions. While Mitigation Measure T-2 would reduce the potentially significant impact to a less than significant level, this measure would require elimination of the existing bicycle lanes along Palos Verdes Drive South, which may not be feasible. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, the impact at this roadway segment would remain potentially significant and unavoidable. Because less construction and grading would be allowed under this alternative, construction traffic impacts would be reduced in comparison, particularly as the amount of soil that would be hauled out of the area could be reduced by up to nearly 50%, which would reduce construction-related traffic impacts when compared to the proposed project. Nevertheless, as with the proposed project, impacts related to construction traffic would be less than significant.

Utilities

The overall building area under this alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed project. However, because this alternative would involve development of the same number of residential units as the proposed project (31 units), the generation of wastewater would be similar to the proposed project. As discussed in Section 4.11, *Utilities and Service Systems*, currently wastewater conveyance facilities provide service to the 69 developed lots, but not to the 31 undeveloped lots or the 11 lots which have obtained permits for development. Without the extension of the Abalone Cover Sewer System conveyance infrastructure to the 31 undeveloped lots, this alternative, like the proposed project, would have a potentially significant impact. However, as with the proposed project, adherence to City requirements and mitigation measures U-1(a) through U-1(d) would reduce impacts related to wastewater conveyance under this alternative to a less than significant level.

6.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED, BUT REJECTED

As required by Section 15126.6 (c) of the *CEQA Guidelines,* this subsection identifies those alternatives that were considered but rejected by the lead agency because they either did not meet the objectives of the project, were considered infeasible, or could not avoid or substantially

lessen one or more of the significant effects. Six alternatives were considered that were rejected. Each is listed below along with a brief description and reason it was rejected.

- *Rejected Alternative 1: This alternative would include the merging of any sub-standard lots with adjacent, contiguous parcels owned by the same property owner. The new merged lots would be allowed one residential unit per lot and would therefore reduce the total number of new residences allowed by the project. This alternative was rejected because it would not avoid the significant cumulative impacts at the Seahill Drive-Tramonto Drive/Palos Verdes Drive South intersection and the Forrestal Drive/Palos Verdes Drive South intersection during the peak hour period based on preliminary analyses. In addition, this alternative would require the property owners to merge parcels, which could lead to litigation against the City.*

- *Rejected Alternative 2: This alternative would involve requiring property owners that propose development of individual lots to collectively fund service upgrades related to the drainage system. The purpose of this alternative would be to avoid the proposed project's less than significant impacts related to drainage to Altamira Canyon. This alternative was rejected because it would not avoid the significant cumulative impacts at the Seahill Drive-Tramonto Drive/Palos Verdes Drive South intersection and the Forrestal Drive/Palos Verdes Drive South intersection during the peak hour period based on preliminary analyses. Further, this alternative was determined to be infeasible since the collectively funded service upgrades may not allow the City to fully implement the upgrades absent other funding resources since only a portion of the overall funding would be collected from the project applicants.*

- *Rejected Alternative 3: Under this alternative, groups of contiguous lots would be merged and multi-family buildings or grouped single-family residences would be constructed instead of single family residences in a "cluster development" configuration to protect open space. This alternative would reduce aesthetic impacts, drainage and other impacts by concentrating development. However, this alternative was determined to be infeasible as it would require a zone change to allow for multi-family residences which is not consistent with the General Plan Land Use designations and would not necessarily avoid the traffic impacts at the three potentially significant intersections. Further, this alternative was considered infeasible since it would require the property owners to agree to merging parcels, thus reducing the economic value of their property, potentially leading to litigation against the City.*

- *Rejected Alternative 4: This alternative would require the City to meter the issuance of building permits (similar to a growth management ordinance) such that growth in the project area would occur over a longer period of time than the proposed project, which assumes that full development of all 31 lots would be developed over a maximum of approximately 10 years. This alternative was deemed infeasible as it could lead to litigation against the City, and may not avoid the project's significant traffic impacts.*

- *Rejected Alternative 5: This would include subdivision of the subject undeveloped or underdeveloped lots in the project area that are divisible to the minimum lot sizes allowed under their respective zoning designations. This alternative was included in the original Draft EIR, which considered 47 lots, 16 of which would have been divisible. However, of the 31 lots currently under consideration, only one is divisible. Thus, this alternative would only*

add one lot, which would not result in any meaningful change in environmental impacts. Moreover, subdivision of lots is a project unto itself that would require its own environmental review under CEQA if any landowners choose to pursue subdivision.

- *Rejected Alternative 6: This alternative assumes that the Landslide Moratorium Ordinance revisions would allow up to 3 new residential units in the project area. Development potential would not be increased on the other 28 vacant or underdeveloped parcels, and they would remain in their current condition. This alternative was also included in the original Draft EIR, but would have allowed 19 residential units (47 minus 28) rather than 3 (31 minus 28). Any selection of the 3 lots would be arbitrary. Moreover, prohibiting development of 28 of 31 lots would be contrary to the intent of the Landslide Moratorium Ordinance Revisions, which are specifically intended to allow legal development of existing lots.*

6.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Table 6-2 on the following page compares the impacts for each of the alternatives to the impacts of the anticipated on-site development.

The No Project Alternative would be the overall environmentally superior alternative as it would generally have superior impacts than the proposed project and would also avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts of the project. However, the No Project Alternative would not achieve the basic project objectives as stated in Section 2.0, *Project Description*.

The Reduced Building Area Alternative would also be environmentally superior to the proposed project. This alternative would have slightly less impact to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, greenhouse gases, fire protection, hydrology and water quality, noise, utilities, as shown in Table 6-2. Additionally, this alternative would have reduced traffic impacts compared to the proposed project. The Reduced Building Area Alternative would achieve the basic project objectives as stated in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, and is potentially feasible.

Table 6-2
Impact Comparison of Alternatives

Issue	Proposed Project	Alternatives	
		No Project	Reduced Building Area Alternative
Aesthetics	=	+	=/+
Air Quality	=	+	=/+
Biological Resources	=	+	=/+
Cultural Resources	=	+	=/+
Geology	=	+	=/+
Greenhouse Gases	=	+	=/+
Fire Protection	=	+	=
Hydrology and Water Quality	=	+	=/+
Noise	=	+	=
Traffic	**=**	+	**=**
Utilities	=	+	=

Bold type indicates a significant and unavoidable impact

+ Superior to the proposed project analyzed in the EIR (reduced level of impact)
- Inferior to the proposed project analyzed in the EIR (increased level of impact)
= /+ Slightly superior to the proposed project analyzed in the EIR in one or more aspects, but not significantly superior
= /- Slightly inferior to the proposed project analyzed in the EIR in one or more aspects, but not significantly inferior
= Similar level of impact to the proposed project analyzed in the EIR