CHAPTER 6
Analysis of Alternatives

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 Approach to Alternatives Analysis

According to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must describe a reasonable range of alternatives to a proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives, and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the proposed project's significant environmental effects. Section 15126.6(f) of the CEQA Guidelines provides direction on the required alternatives analysis:

> The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. 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. The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making.

An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, the alternatives must be limited to those that meet the project objectives, are feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen at least one of the significant environmental effects of the project. "Feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors. Section 15126.6(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states that 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 the project objectives, or could be more costly.

Section 15126.6 (d) of the CEQA Guidelines provides further guidance on the extent of alternatives analysis required:

> 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.

The EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives and the information the lead agency relied on when making the selection. It also should identify any alternatives considered but rejected as infeasible by the lead agency during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons for the exclusion. Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects.

Section 15126.6(e)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines also requires that the No Project Alternative be addressed in this analysis. The purpose of evaluating the No Project Alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the potential consequences of the proposed project with the consequences that would occur without implementation of the proposed project.

Finally, an EIR must identify the environmentally superior alternative. The No Project Alternative may be environmentally superior to the proposed project based on the minimization or avoidance of physical environmental impacts. CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6[e][2]) require that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among other alternatives.

6.1.2 Project Objectives

The objectives of the proposed project are to:

- Reduce the risk to public safety and property that would result from an emergency release.
- Reduce the risk to Department of Water Resources (DWR) Operations and Maintenance staff from operating the emergency release structure.
- Build an emergency release facility that can be operated to drawdown Lake Perris to meet Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD) release volume requirements.

6.1.3 Review of Significant Environmental Impacts

The proposed project would consist of three segments, the State Recreation Area (SRA) Segment, Fairgrounds Segment, and Western Segment (see Figure 2-2). The SRA Segment would upgrade to an existing emergency release structure and construct two levees within the Lake Perris SRA. These levees would convey the water release from the emergency release structure toward a new drainage basin and weir connecting to the next segment. The Fairgrounds Segment would construct an unlined, dual-use channel along the southern portion of the Lake Perris Fairgrounds where parking and a motocross facility would be impacted during construction activities. Once the unlined channel is constructed, Lake Perris Fairgrounds activities would return to preconstruction activities within 10 of the 13 acres designated for the proposed channel. Bridges

or culverts would be constructed at Avalon Parkway and Lake Perris Drive. The water would be conveyed to the Western Segment where an unlined channel would be constructed, ending with a new weir at the connection to the Perris Valley Channel. Improvements within the Perris Valley Channel would be required and a bridge or box culvert would be constructed at Evans Road.

As discussed in Section 6.1.1, the range of alternatives required to be evaluated in an EIR is limited to those alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the proposed project and would feasibly attain most of the project objectives.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts—during the construction period—to aesthetics, noise, and transportation and traffic: (1) construction impacts would degrade the existing visual character of the project site and its surroundings; (2) noise impacts would increase ambient noise levels; and (3) daily traffic flows on local roadways would be temporarily disrupted during bridge and box culvert construction.

In addition, the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, and public services, utilities, and service systems. However, these impacts could be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures. Other resource areas were determined to have less-than-significant impacts or no impacts and are not discussed further as part of this alternatives analysis.

6.2 Development of Alternatives

To achieve the project objectives, DWR developed several project designs for efficiently conveying dam releases to the Perris Valley Channel. These design alternatives were included and evaluated in the 2010 Draft EIR prepared for the Perris Dam Remediation Program. During public review of the Draft EIR, DWR received suggestions for modifications to the proposed design that could minimize or reduce significant impacts associated with the original alternatives. As a result of these comments, DWR developed additional alternatives for the proposed emergency release facility that are evaluated in this EIR. As described in Section 3 of this EIR, the newly proposed project could result in significant impacts. As required by CEQA, additional alternatives were developed that could avoid these impacts. These alternatives were developed internally by DWR as well as by stakeholders that provided input during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) scoping process. Some of these new alternatives were rejected as infeasible. Others were found to result in greater impacts than the proposed project. The following sections describe these alternatives and compare them with the proposed project.

6.3 Alternatives Rejected from Further Consideration

6.3.1 Rider Avenue Alternative

The City of Perris recommended that the EIR evaluate installing a conveyance within the corridor currently used by Metropolitan Water District’s Colorado River Aqueduct within Rider Avenue from Ramona Expressway to the Perris Valley Channel. This alternative would avoid impacting the Fairgrounds and would therefore avoid the significant impacts of the proposed project to land

use. However, this alternative was rejected as infeasible. First, connecting the dam outlet with a conveyance in Rider Avenue would require crossing Ramona Avenue through tunneling. The tunneling would be conducted through hard rock similar to the outlet tunnel. This would significantly increase the cost of the project. In addition, the Rider Avenue corridor is currently developed as a "green-space" since it overlies the Colorado River Aqueduct. Placement of a channel over the buried aqueduct would require the approval of the Metropolitan Water District, which would be unlikely to approve the project because of the potential for impacts and interference with the aqueduct. Furthermore, the construction of an open channel through the city of Perris residential neighborhood would result in additional impacts to residences from construction and land use impacts that could be significant and unavoidable. For these reasons, the Rider Avenue Alternative was rejected from further consideration as infeasible.

6.3.2 Perris Valley Channel Improvements

The primary objective of the project is to convey emergency release water from the emergency release structure to the Perris Valley Channel. However, the Perris Valley Channel is undersized to convey the full flow of 3,800 cfs. DWR considered a project alternative that would include improvements to the Perris Valley Channel and subsequent water conveyance and storage facilities downstream with enough capacity to convey the full flow of 3,800 cfs to Railroad Canyon Reservoir. This alternative would involve a substantial increase in project cost, making the entire project infeasible. It was also determined that with implementation of the Lake Perris Emergency Release Facility Operations and Maintenance Manual procedures, the requirements to build a system capable of conveying 3,800 cfs could be accomplished, yet the system would operate at decreased release levels until such a time that the Perris Valley Channel is improved by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD). Currently, the RCFCWCD plans to improve the Perris Valley Channel incrementally, funding the project with development fees as development advances in the valley. The completion of all improvements to the channel will depend on the pace of development and the availability of funding to the RCFCWCD.

6.4 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Five alternatives are identified in this EIR. One alternative consists of a modification to the SRA Segment (Alternative 1 – Channel Only Alternative). Three other alternatives consist of modifications to the Fairgrounds Segment (Alternative 2 – Fairgrounds Segment Concrete-Lined Channel Alternative; Alternative 3 – Fairgrounds Segment Unlined Channel Alternative; and Alternative 4 – Fairgrounds Segment Fully Covered Alternative). Three of these alternatives (Alternatives 2, 3, and 4) would avoid or minimize significant impacts of the proposed project.

The proposed project alternatives analyzed below would meet all of the proposed project objectives, except the No Project Alternative (Alternative 5). The ability of this alternative to meet the proposed project objectives is further described in Section 6.5.3. **Table 6-1** provides a comparison of the alternatives with the proposed project.

Alternative 1: Channel Only

Alternative 1 would be an unlined, open trapezoidal channel for the entire length of the emergency release facility. The alternative is also referred to as the Linear Lake Alternative. The Western Segment and Fairgrounds Segment would be constructed similarly to what was described for the proposed project. The proposed project's SRA Segment levees would not be constructed and would be replaced by an unlined, open trapezoidal channel running along the southern portion of the SRA and commencing at the emergency release structure, where similar upgrades would be implemented as described for the proposed project. A 20-foot-wide service road would run parallel to the conveyance channel along both sides. The maximum total affected width for the open channel would be 160-feet, including the service roads. Off-site soil export would be required as part of Alternative 1.

Alternative 2: Fairgrounds Segment – Concrete-Lined Channel

Alternative 2 would construct a rectangular concrete chute approximately 60 feet wide and 6 feet deep with vertical side walls. The concrete chute would occupy an area of approximately 7 acres along the southern edge of the Fairgrounds (see **Figure 6-1**). A 15-foot-wide service road would run parallel to the conveyance channel along both sides. The SRA Segment and Western Segment would be constructed in a similar manner to the proposed project. Upgrades to the emergency release structure would also remain unchanged. Off-site soil export would not be required as part of Alternative 2.

Alternative 3: Fairgrounds Segment – Unlined Channel

Alternative 3 would construct a slower flowing, unlined trapezoidal channel. The channel would be 25 feet deep on the east end and gradually become 11 feet deep on the west end. The channel would be approximately 140 feet wide at the top and 100 feet at the bottom and have 2:1 side slopes. The trapezoidal channel would occupy approximately 12 acres along the southern edge of the Fairgrounds (see **Figure 6-2**). A 15-foot-wide service road would run parallel to the conveyance channel along both sides. The SRA Segment and Western Segment would be constructed in a similar manner to the proposed project. Upgrades to the emergency release structure would also remain unchanged. Off-site soil export would not be required as part of Alternative 3.

Alternative 4: Fairgrounds Segment – Fully Covered Channel

Under the Fairgrounds Segment – Fully Covered Alternative (Alternative 4), the proposed emergency release facility within the Lake Fairgrounds Segment would be constructed underground as either a box culvert or pipeline. The impact area for the construction of this alternative would be similar to that of Alternative 2. A 15-foot-wide service road would run parallel to the conveyance channel along the southern side. The SRA Segment and Western Segment would be constructed in a similar manner to the proposed project. Upgrades to the emergency release structure would also remain unchanged. Off-site soil export would not be required as part of Alternative 4.

TABLE 6-1
OMPARISON OF THE ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Project Alternatives	SRA Segment	Fairgrounds Segment	Western Segment
Alternative 1: Channel Only	An open, unlined channel would be constructed instead of the proposed levees. Export of materials off-site would be required.	No change to proposed project.	No change to proposed project.
Alternative 2: Fairgrounds Segment – Concrete-Lined Channel	No change to proposed project.	Open concrete-lined channel with steeper side slopes and smaller impact footprint instead of the dual-use unlined channel. Would not allow for Fairgrounds activities within the channel.	No change to proposed project.
Alternative 3: Fairgrounds Segment – Unlined Channel	No change to proposed project.	Open unlined channel with steeper side slopes and smaller impact footprint instead of the dual-use unlined channel. Would not allow for Fairgrounds activities within the channel.	No change to proposed project.
Alternative 4: Fairgrounds Segment – Fully Covered Fairgrounds Segment	No change to proposed project.	Box culvert or pipeline instead of the dual-use, unlined channel.	No change to proposed project.
Alternative 5: No Project	None of the facilities would be constructed or upgraded.	None of the facilities would be constructed.	None of the facilities would be constructed.

SOURCE: Google Earth

Perris Dam Emergency Release Facility . 120083.02

Figure 6-1

Alternative 2: Fairgrounds Segment – Concrete-lined Channel

SOURCE: Google Earth

Perris Dam Emergency Release Facility . 120083.02

Figure 6-2

Alternative 3: Fairgrounds Segment – Unlined Channel

6.5 Alternative Impact Analysis

6.5.1 SRA Segment Alternative

The alternative impact assessment below focuses on the impact differences of only the SRA Segment since all other project components would be identical to those described for the proposed project.

Alternative 1: Channel Only

Impact Assessment

Aesthetics

The proposed project would result in a temporary significant and unavoidable aesthetics impact during construction (see Section 3.1). Alternative 1 and the proposed project would require similar construction equipment and similar construction duration. As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 1 would result in similar aesthetic impacts during construction.

Air Quality

The proposed project would result in in less-than-significant impacts to air quality with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.2). Alternative 1 and the proposed project would require similar construction techniques along the SRA Segment to those applied along the other two segments to construct a channel. Deeper excavation would be required for the construction of the channel than described for the SRA Segment in the proposed project. Alternative 1 would not be able to use the excavated soil from all three segments along the levees as was part of the proposed project. Soils would not be balanced on-site and additional off-site truck trips would be required, resulting in increased air quality impacts. As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 1 would result in greater air quality impacts.

Biological Resources

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to biological resources with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.3). Under Alternative 1, an open unlined channel would be constructed instead of the proposed project's levee system. Alternative 1 would remove existing habitat below the dam and replace it with an unlined open channel void of habitat. The channel would be periodically maintained and would not provide suitable habitat for small mammals. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in impacts to biological resources that would be greater than the proposed project and would require additional mitigation and potentially requiring coverage under the MSHCP.

Cultural Resources

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.4). Under Alternative 1, the impact footprint within the SRA Segment would be slightly modified but contained within the same general area below the dam. In addition, excavation depths within the SRA Segment would be deeper than what was described for the proposed project. However, implementation of the mitigation measures described for the proposed project would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. As a

result, Alternative 1 would result in similar impacts to the proposed project related to cultural resources and would need to incorporate the same mitigation measures.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.8). Alternative 1 would be similar to the proposed project in distance from sensitive receptors and would use similar construction equipment. Alternative 1 would result in similar impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials to the proposed project and would need to incorporate the same mitigation measures.

Land Use and Planning

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to land use and planning with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.3-10). Alternative 1 would impact the same areas and therefore the same habitat conservation plan as described in the proposed project. However, Alternative 1 would remove existing habitat below the dam and replace it with an unlined open channel void of habitat. The channel would be periodically maintained and would not provide suitable habitat for small mammals. This would result in additional mitigation and potentially requiring coverage under the MSHCP and SKR HCP. Thus, Alternative 1 would result in greater land use impacts to the proposed project.

Noise

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to ambient noise levels during nighttime construction (see Section 3.11). Once constructed, the proposed project area would return to normal ambient noise levels. Alternative 1 would include similar construction activities within a similar impact footprint area as described for the proposed project and would be located at a similar distance to sensitive receptors. Therefore, ambient noise levels would not increase beyond what was described for the proposed project. Alternative 1 would still result in significant and unavoidable impacts, similar to the proposed project, and would need to implement the same mitigation measures.

Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to utilities and service systems with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.12). Under Alternative 1, the impact footprint within the SRA Segment would be slightly modified but contained within the same general area below the dam. Also, excavation depths within the SRA Segment would be deeper than what was described for the proposed project. However, implementation of the mitigation measures described for the proposed project would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Consequently, Alternative 1 would result in similar impacts to the proposed project related to public services, utilities, and service systems resources and would need to implement the same mitigation measures.

Traffic and Transportation

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable traffic and circulation impacts with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.14). Alternative 1 would construct facilities within the

same areas described for the proposed project and would use the same roads on- and off-site. Truck trips would increase because of the need to haul excess dirt from the excavation of the channel along the entire emergency release facility. Unlike the proposed project, Alternative 1 would not construct levees and would not be able to balance all of the soil on-site. There would also be a slight loss of acreage within the parking area and fairground facilities compared to the proposed project. Alternative 1 would result in greater impacts related to traffic and transportation than the proposed project.

Summary

Under the Channel Only Alternative (Alternative 1), impacts would be similar to the proposed project for most resource areas. Impacts to air quality, biological resources, land use, and traffic would increase beyond what was described for the proposed project. None of the significant and unavoidable impacts would be reduced. See **Table 6-2** for a comparison of all Alternative 1 impacts to the proposed project.

6.5.2 Fairgrounds Segment Alternatives

The following alternative impact assessment focuses on the differences between the Fairgrounds Segment of Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 since all other project components (segments) would be identical to those described for the proposed project.

Alternative 2: Fairgrounds Segment – Concrete-Lined Channel

Impact Assessment

Aesthetics

The proposed project would result in a temporary significant and unavoidable aesthetics impacts during construction (see Section 3.1). Alternative 2 and the proposed project would require similar construction equipment and similar construction duration. As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would result in similar aesthetic impacts during construction.

Air Quality

Because Alternative 2 would require additional material, construction equipment, and additional time to complete the project, Alternative 2 would result in greater air quality impacts than the proposed project. The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to air quality with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.2). As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would result in greater air quality impacts.

Biological Resources

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to biological resources with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.3). Biological impacts of the proposed project would occur mainly as part of the construction and implementation of components along the SRA Segment. These biological impacts would remain the same for Alternative 2 because no changes to the SRA Segment would occur. The modified construction of the emergency release facility along the Fairgrounds Segment would impact a smaller footprint than that described for the proposed project and would not create any new impacts to biological resources. As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to biological resources and would

need to incorporate the same mitigation measures as the proposed project to result in less-than-significant impacts.

Cultural Resources

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.4). Under Alternative 2, the footprint of the impact area would be reduced and excavation depths would remain the same as described for the proposed project. As a result, Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to the proposed project related to cultural resources and would need to incorporate the same mitigation measures.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.8). Alternative 2 would require similar equipment and construction activities as described for the proposed project, but for a longer duration of time. Construction of Alternative 2 would occur within a smaller footprint than the proposed project and would require the channel to be lined with concrete. The potential for hazardous materials releases, wildland fires, and site safety impacts would slightly increase for Alternative 2 because of the increase in construction duration and additional concrete. Nevertheless, mitigation measures would remain the same and would reduce impacts similar to those of the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have similar impacts to the proposed project related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Land Use and Planning

The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to land use and planning with mitigation incorporation (see Section 3.10). In general, Alternative 2 would impact the same areas as described in the proposed project. Therefore, the similar impact to the existing habitat conservation plan would occur. Alternative 2 would result in similar land use impacts to the proposed project and the same mitigation would need to be incorporated.

Noise

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable short-term impacts to ambient noise levels during nighttime construction (see Section 3.11). Once constructed, the proposed project area would return to normal ambient noise levels. Alternative 2 would impact the same areas as described for the proposed project. Because of the lining of the channel with concrete along the Fairgrounds Segment, the number of construction vehicles on-site and the duration that they remain in use may increase. Additionally, noise impacts may increase slightly from an increase in the duration of construction activities. However, ambient noise levels would not increase beyond what was described for the proposed project. In addition, nighttime construction would also be required for this alternative. Alternative 2 would result in similar noise-related impacts to the proposed project and the same mitigation would need to be incorporated.

Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to utilities resources with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.12). Under Alternative 2, the footprint of the impact area would be reduced and excavation depths would remain the same as described for the proposed

project. As a result, Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to the proposed project related to public services, utilities, and service systems and would need to incorporate the same mitigation measures.

Traffic and Transportation

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to traffic and circulation with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.14). Alternative 2 would construct facilities within the same areas described for the proposed project and would use the same roads on- and off-site. Unlike the proposed project, there would be some loss of acreage within the parking area and fairground facilities after construction is completed. Truck trips would increase with the need to import additional concrete for the concrete-lined channel along the Fairgrounds Segment. Alternative 2 would result in greater impacts related to traffic and transportation than the proposed project because additional import of material and additional mitigation measures may be required.

Summary

Under the Fairgrounds Segment – Concrete-Lined Channel Alternative (Alternative 2), impacts would be similar to the proposed project for most resource areas. Impacts to air quality and traffic would increase beyond what was described for the proposed project. None of the significant and unavoidable impacts would be reduced. See Table 6-2 for a comparison of all Alternative 2 impacts to the proposed project.

Alternative 3: Fairgrounds Segment – Unlined Channel

Aesthetics

The proposed project would result in a temporary significant and unavoidable aesthetics impacts during construction (see Section 3.1). Alternative 3 and the proposed project would require similar construction equipment and similar construction duration. As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would result in similar aesthetic impacts during construction.

Air Quality

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to air quality with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.2). The proposed project would construct a similar unlined channel along the Fairgrounds Segment, but with a smaller footprint and would require the same amount of construction materials and equipment as the proposed project. As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to air quality.

Biological Resources

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to biological resources with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.3). Biological impacts of the proposed project would occur mainly as part of the construction and implementation of components along the SRA Segment. These biological impacts would remain the same for Alternative 3 because no changes to the SRA Segment would occur. The modified construction of the emergency release facility along the Fairgrounds Segment would impact a smaller footprint than that described for the proposed project and would not create any new impacts to biological resources. As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to biological resources and would

need to incorporate the same mitigation measures as the proposed project to result in less-than-significant impacts.

Cultural Resources

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.4). Under Alternative 3, the footprint of the impact area would be reduced and excavation depths would remain the same as described for the proposed project. As a result, Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to the proposed project related to cultural resources and would need to incorporate the same mitigation measures.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.8). Alternative 3 would require similar equipment and construction activities as described for the proposed project and would have a similar duration. Alternative 3 would have similar impacts to the proposed project related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Land Use and Planning

The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to land use and planning with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.10). In general, Alternative 3 would impact the same areas as described in the proposed project. Therefore, the similar impact to the existing habitat conservation plan would occur. Alternative 3 would result in similar land use impacts to the proposed project and the same mitigation would need to be incorporated.

Noise

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable short-term impacts to ambient noise levels during nighttime construction (see Section 3.11). Once constructed, the proposed project area would return to normal ambient noise levels. Alternative 3 would impact the same areas as described for the proposed project and would have a similar duration. In addition, nighttime construction would also be required for this alternative. Alternative 3 would result in similar noise-related impacts to the proposed project and the same mitigation would need to be incorporated.

Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to utilities resources with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.12). Under Alternative 3, the footprint of the impact area would be reduced and excavation depths would remain the same as described for the proposed project. As a result, Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to the proposed project related to public services, utilities, and service systems resources and would need to incorporate the same mitigation measures.

Traffic and Transportation

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable traffic and circulation impacts with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.14). Alternative 3 would construct facilities within the same areas described for the proposed project and would use the same roads on- and off-site.

Unlike the proposed project, there would be a slight loss of acreage within the parking area and fairground facilities after construction. Truck trips would remain the same and no additional impacts beyond those described for the proposed project would occur. Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to traffic as the proposed project.

Summary

Under the Fairgrounds Segment – Unlined Channel Alternative (Alternative 3), impacts would be similar to the proposed project for all resource areas. None of the significant and unavoidable impacts would be reduced. See Table 6-2 for a comparison of all Alternative 3 impacts to the proposed project.

Alternative 4: Fairgrounds Segment – Fully Covered Channel

Impact Assessment

Aesthetics

The proposed project would result in a temporary significant and unavoidable aesthetics impacts during construction (see Section 3.1). Alternative 4 and the proposed project would require similar construction equipment and similar construction duration. As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would result in similar aesthetic impacts during construction.

Air Quality

Because Alternative 4 would require additional material, construction equipment, and time to complete the project, Alternative 4 would result in greater air quality impacts than the proposed project. The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to air quality with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.2). As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would result in greater air quality impacts.

Biological Resources

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to biological resources with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.3). Biological impacts of the proposed project would occur mainly as part of the construction and implementation of components along the SRA Segment. These biological impacts would remain the same for Alternative 4 because no changes to the SRA Segment would occur. The modified construction of the emergency release facility along the Fairgrounds Segment would impact a smaller footprint than that described for the proposed project and would not create any new impacts to biological resources. As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts to biological resources and would need to incorporate the same mitigation measures as the proposed project to result in less-than-significant impacts.

Cultural Resources

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.4). Under Alternative 4, the footprint of the impact area would be reduced and excavation depths would remain the same as described for the proposed project. As a result, Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts to the proposed project related to cultural resources and would need to incorporate the same mitigation measures.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.8). Alternative 4 would require similar equipment and construction activities as described for the proposed project, but for a longer duration of time. Construction of Alternative 4 would occur within the same footprint area as the proposed project, but would include covering the release channel along the Fairgrounds Segment. The potential for hazardous materials releases, wildland fires, and site safety impacts would slightly increase for Alternative 4 because of the increase in construction duration. Nevertheless, mitigation measures would remain the same and would reduce impacts similar to those of the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have similar impacts to the proposed project related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Land Use and Planning

The proposed project would result in less than significant with mitigation impacts related to land use and planning (see Section 3.10). In general, Alternative 4 would impact the same areas as described in the proposed project. Therefore, the similar impact to the existing habitat conservation plan would occur. Alternative 4 would result in similar land use impacts to the proposed project and the same mitigation would need to be incorporated.

Noise

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable short-term impacts to ambient noise levels during nighttime construction (see Section 3.11). Once constructed, the proposed project area would return to normal ambient noise levels. Alternative 4 would impact the same areas as described for the proposed project. As a result of the undergrounding of the emergency release channel along the Fairgrounds Segment, the number of construction vehicles on-site and the duration that they remain in use may increase. Additionally, noise impacts may increase slightly from an increase in the duration of construction activities and nighttime construction would still be required. However, ambient noise levels would not increase beyond what was described for the proposed project. Alternative 4 would result in similar noise-related impacts to the proposed project and the same mitigation would need to be incorporated.

Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to utilities resources with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.12). Under Alternative 4, the footprint of the impact area would be reduced and excavation depths would remain the same as described for the proposed project. As a result, Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts to the proposed project related to public services, utilities, and service systems resources and would need to incorporate the same mitigation measures.

Traffic and Transportation

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable traffic and circulation impacts with mitigation incorporated (see Section 3.14). Alternative 4 would construct facilities within the same areas described for the proposed project and would use the same roads on- and off-site. Truck trips would increase with the need to import additional concrete for the underground channel along the Fairgrounds Segment. Similar to the proposed project, the Fairgrounds would

return to pre-project conditions and existing parking availability at the Lake Perris Fairgrounds would not be permanently impacted. Alternative 4 would result in greater impacts related to traffic and transportation than the proposed project because additional hauling of materials on-site and additional mitigation measures may be required.

Summary

Under the Fairgrounds Segment – Fully Covered Alternative (Alternative 4), impacts would be similar to the proposed project for most resource areas. Impacts to air quality and traffic would increase beyond what was described for the proposed project. None of the significant and unavoidable impacts would be reduced. See Table 6-2 for a comparison of all Alternative 4 impacts to the proposed project.

6.5.3 No Project Alternative

Pursuant to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project Alternative shall:

> discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time the environmental analysis is commenced, 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.

The No Project Alternative (Alternative 5) assumes the proposed Emergency Release Facility Project would not be constructed. Public safety and property damage resulting from an emergency release would remain unchecked and impact the surrounding communities.

Alternative 5: No Project

Impact Assessment

The No Project Alternative would not result in short-term construction related impacts because no construction activities would occur. Existing land uses at the Lake Perris SRA and the Perris Fairgrounds would remain and no impacts to aesthetics and biological resources would occur. However, in the event of an emergency release, overflow water would not be contained as compared to the proposed project. Thus, this alternative would increase the level of risk associated with flood hazards downstream of Lake Perris, and would not increase public safety. See Table 6-2 for a comparison of all project alternatives.

6.6 Environmentally Superior Alternative

As previously stated, CEQA requires that an EIR identify an environmentally superior alternative (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e][2]). Table 6-2 shows an impact determination comparison for potentially significant impacts of the proposed project to all the proposed alternatives. The No Project Alternative (Alternative 5) would reduce almost all proposed project impacts, including significant and unavoidable impacts. However, this alternative would increase the level of risk associated with flood hazard. Nevertheless, the No Project Alternative (Alternative 5) would be considered the environmentally superior alternative. If the environmentally superior alternative is

the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

TABLE 6-2
SUMMARY COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVE IMPACTS

Potential Project Impacts	Proposed Project	SRA Segment: Channel Only (Alt 1)	Fairgrounds Segment: Unlined Channel (Alt 2)	Fairgrounds Segment: Concrete-Lined Channel (Alt 3)	Fairgrounds Segment: Fully Covered Channel (Alt 4)	No Project Alternative (Alt 5)
Aesthetics	SU	0	0	0	0	-
Air Quality	LSM	+	+	0	+	-
Biological Resources	LSM	+	0	0	0	-
Cultural Resources	LSM	0	0	0	0	-
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LSM	0	0	0	0	+
Land Use	LSM	+	0	0	0	-
Noise and Vibration	SU	0	0	0	0	-
Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems	LSM	0	0	0	0	-
Transportation and Traffic	SU	+	+	0	+	-

LTS = Less-than-Significant Impact
LSM = Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation
SU = Significant and Unavoidable Impact
NI = No Impact

(-) = lesser impact
(+) = greater impact
(0) = similar/no difference

All four of the other proposed project alternatives would meet the project objectives but would not reduce any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project. In addition, Alternative 1 would increase impacts to air quality, biological resources, land use, and traffic; Alternative 2 would increase impacts to air quality and traffic; Alternative 3 would not increase impacts to any resources; and Alternative 4 would increase impacts to air quality and traffic.

Since the proposed project would cause the least amount of impact of the identified feasible build alternatives, it would be considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.