

5.1 Introduction

According to CEQA, an EIR must describe a reasonable range of alternatives to a proposed project that could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives and avoid or reduce any of the significant impacts. Additionally, a “no project” alternative must be analyzed. An EIR must evaluate the comparative merits of each of the alternatives. The range of alternatives in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires an EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, the alternatives must be limited to ones that meet the project objectives, are feasible,¹ and avoid or substantially reduce at least one of the significant environmental effects of the project.

The EIR must briefly describe the rationale for the selection and rejection of alternatives and identify the information the lead agency relied on when making the selection. It should also identify any alternatives that were 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.

This chapter identifies two alternatives, including the No-Project Alternative, that attain some of the project objectives, are feasible, and avoid or lessen environmental impacts. This chapter concludes by identifying the environmentally superior alternative.

5.2 Project Objectives

As discussed in Chapter 3, the project objectives are as follows:

- Create an updated, modernized secondary school campus that provides for the intellectual, physical, social, and spiritual needs of the student body through an integrated campus design that meets educational and technological demands.
- Implement a coordinated revitalization plan that allows the campus to meet the needs of the allowed number of students.
- Combine old and new architecture to enable the campus to function as an integrated and state-of-the-art educational facility that meets the needs of students and visitors.
- Maximize resources for an overall limited number of students efficiently and effectively.
- Allow FSHA to remain competitive with other comparable educational institutions by offering a physical facility that is able to support the resources necessary to maintain a diverse student body and existing certifications.

¹ “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 (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15364).

- Effectively manage vehicular traffic when entering and exiting the school campus.
- Create a physically attractive and historically sensitive school campus that is compatible with the surrounding environment.
- Preserve and protect the Dominican Sisters' mission of educating a diverse population of young women, which has extended more than 80 years.

In addition to the Specific Plan goals, the following project and development objectives are identified to ensure that all the Specific Plan goals are met:

- To modernize the FSHA facilities to meet the demands of 21st-century education.
- To allow for phased improvements and modernization of the FSHA campus as a whole while regulating development in harmony with all neighboring single-family uses.
- To benefit and support the FSHA's arts and humanities programs by consolidating arts and humanities into a single building and providing improved and expanded performing arts space in a modern facility.
- To modernize and expand the FSHA's existing High School Building to meet current 21st-century needs.
- To consolidate and centralize campus parking and reduce the number of surface parking areas.
- To improve on-campus vehicular circulation and reduce traffic impacts on neighborhood streets.
- To respect and reinforce the architectural and landscape traditions that give the FSHA campus its unique character.
- To increase the functionality of the campus space and provide access throughout while respecting the natural hillside terrain.
- To modernize the FSHA campus by integrating Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access and mobility standards into new improvements in a manner that establishes equivalent accessibility for all.
- To minimize the visual impact and height of new buildings by building into hillsides wherever feasible.
- To increase FSHA's enrollment to 425 students to reflect FSHA's current educational capacity.
- To establish comprehensive long-term planning of the entire FSHA campus for administration by the City of La Cañada Flintridge.

5.3 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration

An EIR must briefly describe the rationale for the selection and rejection of alternatives. The lead agency may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are potentially feasible and therefore merit in-depth consideration, and which are clearly infeasible. Alternatives that are remote or speculative, or the effects of which cannot be reasonably predicted, need not be considered (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(3)).

This section identifies alternatives considered by the lead agency but rejected as infeasible and provides a brief explanation regarding the reasons for their exclusion. As noted above, 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 (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c)).

5.3.1 Alternative Site

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2) requires an alternative location for the project to be examined, provided such a location would result in the avoidance or lessening of significant impacts. The intent of the proposed project is to redevelop the project site. Unlike other project types in which a developer searches for suitable property throughout a city or region, in this case, the choice of location is not discretionary because FSHA has been an active school since 1931. The acquisition of new property near the site of the campus that would meet the project objectives for campus modernization would present prohibitive costs and be infeasible. As such, further analysis of this alternative is not required.

5.4 Project Alternatives

5.4.1 Alternative 1—No-Project Alternative

Under the No-Project Alternative, no modifications to the campus would be made. Student enrollment and staff employment would remain at existing levels. (Although some improvements and expansion would be allowed under the school's existing conditional use permit, for this analysis it is assumed that no improvements or expansion would be made.)

Environmental Impact

Aesthetics

Under the No-Project Alternative, no demolition or construction activities would occur. FSHA would have the same visual presence it currently has. No impact would occur.

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases

Under the No-Project Alternative, there would be no air quality or greenhouse gas emissions related to construction activities because none would be undertaken. Operationally, student enrollment at FSHA would not increase above current levels and the number of vehicle trips to the site would not increase. Therefore, there would be no increase in vehicle-related emissions of criteria pollutants or greenhouse gases. Air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions resulting from energy consumption would remain at present levels. No impact would occur.

Biological Resources

Under the No-Project Alternative, no construction activities would occur and no on-site species would be affected. No impact would occur.

Cultural Resources

Under the No-Project Alternative, there would be no soil disturbances that could uncover archaeological or paleontological resources. In addition, Cottages 1 and 2 would not be demolished under the No-Project Alternative. No impact would occur.

Geology and Soils

Under the No-Project Alternative, no construction activities would occur that would increase the risk of soil destabilization and erosion. No impact would occur.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the No-Project Alternative, there would be no demolition activities that would result in the release of asbestos-containing materials. In addition, no lane closures that could delay emergency responders would occur. No impact would occur.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the No-Project Alternative, site drainage would occur as it does at present. Construction activities would not temporarily denude sites and possibly release pollutants and other suspended particles. Changes to permeable surfaces would not occur; therefore, there would be no effect on groundwater recharge. No impact would occur.

Land Use

Under the No-Project Alternative, the FSHA campus would continue to operate as a secondary school and with the same enrollment. No impact would occur.

Noise

Under the No-Project Alternative, no construction activities would occur that would increase ambient noise in the area around the campus. Operational noise levels would not change. No impact would occur.

Public Services

Under the No-Project Alternative, no construction activities would occur that could disrupt or delay police and fire protection services or affect schools, parks, recreational resources, or other public facilities. No impact would occur.

Transportation and Traffic

Under the No-Project Alternative, existing vehicular circulation patterns would continue as at present. No impact would occur.

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy

Under the No-Project Alternative, there would be no disruptions to electrical service, water and wastewater services, or solid waste services as a result of project construction. In addition, energy consumption would not change from present levels because no change in the energy efficiency of the buildings on the campus would occur. No impact would occur.

Achievement of Project Objectives

The No-Project Alternative would not revitalize and modernize the FSHA campus, nor would it consolidate or otherwise improve vehicular circulation in the area. In addition, under the No-Project Alternative, student enrollment would not increase to the desired level of 425 students. With the exception of retaining the integrity of the historic features of the campus, the No-Project Alternative would fail to realize the central motivation for the project, which is to modernize the campus in a way that meets educational and technological demands.

5.4.2 Alternative 2—Reduced Project Development Alternative

The Reduced Project Development Alternative represents a scenario in which the scale of the physical improvements proposed under the four-area development program would be reduced by minimizing the size of the parking structure and retaining the existing Auditorium and High School Buildings (see Figure 5-1). Upgrades and modernization would be accomplished through a series of building additions and interior remodeling. Under this alternative, demolition of Cottages 1 and 2 would still be required. The enrollment capacity of FSHA would increase to 425 students.

Under this alternative, the volume of demolition debris and soil export material would be substantially reduced; thus, the number of truck trips during construction activity would be reduced. Furthermore, the maximum size of the new partially subterranean parking structure would be reduced in size from 3.5 levels (per the proposed project) to 2.5 levels, providing 179 parking spaces (compared with 240 spaces under the proposed project). The parking structure would be designed so that the top deck, ramp access from St. Katherine Drive, the size of the footprint, and the appearance from the street would be similar to that of the proposed project. The total number of stalls would include 146 standard, 26 tandem, and 7 accessible spaces, for a total of approximately 179 spaces.

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, the existing auditorium would not be demolished but would be remodeled. This would include the incorporation of a 6,600-square-foot addition on the lower levels of the building. Compared with the proposed project, which could have a total built area of 44,000 square feet, under this alternative, the remodeled and expanded Arts and Humanities Building would be limited to 18,600 square feet. Seating capacity would be limited to 264 retractable bleacher seats and 236 loose chairs (total 500 seats). The proposed modifications would focus on improving the theater's functional capacity. The new one-story addition would be added around the exterior of the building to accommodate visual and performing arts classrooms and support spaces. Exterior mechanical units would be located at ground level on the western side of the existing auditorium and enclosed with a screen. The proposed additions, outdoor patio, and mechanical areas on the southern and western sides of the building would be located on the sloped portion of the site. Fire-life safety and accessibility upgrades would be implemented along with upgrades to the heating/air/ventilation systems. There would be no net increase in the height of the roofline because the existing building would be retained.

With the Reduced Project Development Alternative, the size and footprint of the High School Building would remain unchanged, and the west wing would not be demolished. Construction would be limited to interior remodeling, thereby creating a more efficient use of interior space.

The new athletic field area off Palmerstone Drive would be essentially the same as under the proposed project; however, the elevation of the site would be slightly lower because the volume of

soil excavated from the parking structure and Arts and Humanities Building would be reduced, thereby reducing the volume of available fill to place within Plan Area 4.

The same upgrades to the electrical system and additional Southern California Edison (SCE) subtransmission line would be required for the Reduced Project Development Alternative.

Environmental Impact

Aesthetics

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, the new partially subterranean parking structure would be 2.5 levels instead of 3.5 levels. In addition, Cottages 1 and 2 would be demolished. The existing auditorium would be remodeled, and an addition would be constructed. Modifications to the High School Building would be limited to interior remodeling. Changes to the visual environment occurring as a result of implementation of the Reduced Project Development Alternative would be the addition of a 2.5-level partially subterranean parking structure on the site of an existing surface lot, the ground-level addition to the auditorium, and the removal of Cottages 1 and 2. These changes are not expected to degrade the visual character of the site substantially, affect scenic vistas, or introduce new forms of light or glare. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, the campus enrollment cap would be increased to 425 students. This would result in more vehicle trips to the campus, marginally increasing criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions. Pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions stemming from energy use would also be slightly higher than they are at the existing campus as a result of having to meet the energy demands of the new parking structure and the auditorium addition. The same mitigation measures to reduce construction-related emissions as required for the proposed project would be incorporated into the Reduced Project Development Alternative. Therefore, the increases in emissions would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Biological Resources

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, impacts on biological resources would be nearly identical to those that would occur under the proposed project. The same mitigation measures as required for the proposed project for impacts related to construction resulting from the SCE subtransmission line and the introduction of invasive plants would be incorporated into the Reduced Project Development Alternative. Therefore, impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Cultural Resources

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, the potential to encounter archaeological and paleontological resources during the construction period is low. With respect to historic resources, however, Cottages 1 and 2 would be demolished under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, resulting in a significant impact. Significant and unavoidable impacts would occur, even with incorporation of the same mitigation as required for the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, there would be some risk of soil instability and erosion associated with denuding the sites for construction of the new parking structure and the auditorium addition as well as demolition of Cottages 1 and 2. Modifications proposed under the Reduced Project Development Alternative would be built to existing building code standards. With incorporation of mitigation for erosion impacts similar to that required for the proposed project, geology and soils impacts of the Reduced Project Development Alternative would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, some structures that are likely to contain asbestos would be demolished, which has the potential to release contaminants into the air. Temporary lane closures during the construction period could result in delays. With incorporation of mitigation as required for the proposed project, including scheduling demolition when few students are present and requiring a Traffic Management Plan, impacts of the Reduced Project Development Alternative would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, there would be little change with respect to the total area of impermeable surfaces, and drainage patterns would remain similar to existing patterns. There is the potential for pollutants and suspended particles to be carried from the site as runoff. With incorporation of mitigation requiring implementation of Best Management Practices per a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan to address significant water quality impacts, as required for the proposed project, impacts of the Reduced Project Development Alternative would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Land Use

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, the campus would continue to operate as an educational facility but with an increased enrollment cap of 425 students. No change in land use would occur. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Noise

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, there would be unavoidable temporary noise associated with construction. However, construction noise is exempted under LCF's Municipal Code when it occurs Monday through Friday between the hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. or on Saturday between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Project construction would occur during these hours. There may also be operational noise associated with tire squealing in the new parking structure. With incorporation of mitigation for tire squeal, as required for the proposed project, impacts of the Reduced Project Development Alternative would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Public Services

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, partial road closures have the potential to increase delays for emergency service responders in the area, but with implementation of a Traffic Management Plan, as required for the proposed project, impacts of the Reduced Project

Development Alternative would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Impacts on schools and surrounding parks and recreational facilities would also be less than significant. Following construction, there would be no operational impacts on public services.

Transportation and Traffic

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, the number of vehicle trips to and from the FSHA campus would increase as a result of increasing the student enrollment cap to 425 students, but this increase would not result in significant impacts on traffic during construction or operation. Construction-period land closures and hazards related to the SCE subtransmission line and short-term parking impacts would be significant, but would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with incorporation of mitigation similar to that required for the proposed project.

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy

Under the Reduced Project Development Alternative, minor disruptions to utility services may occur, but such disruptions would be temporary and coordinated with school staff members and affected neighbors. Energy usage may increase because additional power could be required to operate the parking structure and auditorium addition. The increase in energy would be slight, and impacts would be less than significant.

Achievement of Project Objectives

The Reduced Project Development Alternative would modernize the FSHA campus, albeit in a more limited way than the proposed project, relying more on remodeling rather than new construction. Remodeling efforts would be consistent, retaining the unique landscaping and architectural features of the campus while at the same time modifying the facilities to meet current and future educational and technological needs. This alternative would also consolidate and centralize campus parking resources, as specified in the project objectives.

5.4.3 Alternative 3—Retained Cottages Alternative

The Retained Cottages Alternative would be similar to the proposed project, except that Cottages 1 and 2, located in a building north of the proposed Arts and Humanities building, would be retained. Retaining the cottages would necessitate reconfiguration of parking and pedestrian access areas as well as improvements related to access under the ADA (see Figure 5-2). The footprint of the Arts and Humanities Building would be adjusted to ensure adequate spacing between it and Cottages 1 and 2.

The same upgrades to the electrical system and additional SCE subtransmission line would be required for the Retained Cottages Alternative.

Environmental Impact

Aesthetics

Under the Retained Cottages Alternative, a 3.5-level partially subterranean parking structure, a new Arts and Humanities Building, and an addition to the High School Building would all be constructed, as would be the case under the proposed project. The Retained Cottages Alternative, however, would not result in the demolition of Cottages 1 and 2. These changes are not expected to

substantially degrade the visual character of the site, affect scenic vistas, or introduce new forms of light or glare. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases

Under the Retained Cottages Alternative, the campus enrollment cap would be increased to 425 students, which would result in more vehicle trips to the campus, marginally increasing criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions. Pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions stemming from energy use would also be slightly higher than they are at the existing campus as a result of having to meet the energy demands of the new parking structure and the auditorium addition. The same mitigation measures to reduce construction-related emissions as required for the proposed project would be incorporated into the Retained Cottages Alternative. Therefore, the increases in emissions would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Biological Resources

Under the Retained Cottages Alternative, impacts on biological resources would be nearly identical to those that would occur under the proposed project. Impacts are expected to be less than significant. The same mitigation measures as required for the proposed project for impacts related to construction impacts resulting from the SCE subtransmission line and the introduction of invasive plants would be incorporated into the Retained Cottages Alternative. Therefore, impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Cultural Resources

Under the Retained Cottages Alternative, Cottages 1 and 2, which are considered contributing features to a historic district, would not be demolished. However, the parking structure would change the setting of the historic district by introducing a physical and visual obstruction that would alter views between the Administration Building and the cottages, changing the relationship of the contributing features of the historic district and diminishing the district's ability to convey its significance as an architecturally unified complex. Impacts would be significant, but mitigation through appropriate design could reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Geology and Soils

Under the Retained Cottages Alternative, there would be some risk of soil instability and erosion associated with denuding the sites for construction of the new parking structure, the Arts and Humanities Building, and the High School Building addition. Modifications proposed under the Retained Cottages Alternative would be built to existing building code standards. With incorporation of mitigation for erosion impacts similar to that required for the proposed project, geology and soils impacts of the Retained Cottages Alternative would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Retained Cottages Alternative, the demolition of structures that are likely to contain asbestos would occur, which has the potential to result in the release of contaminants into the air. Temporary lane closures during the construction period could result in delays. With incorporation of mitigation as required for the proposed project, including scheduling demolition when few students are present and requiring a Traffic Management Plan, impacts of the Retained Cottages Alternative would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the Retained Cottages Alternative, there would be an increase in the total area of impermeable surfaces, but overall drainage patterns would remain similar to existing patterns. There is the potential for pollutants and suspended particles to be carried from the site as runoff. With incorporation of mitigation requiring implementation of Best Management Practices per a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan to address significant water quality impacts, as required for the proposed project, impacts of the Retained Cottages Alternative would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Land Use

Under the Retained Cottages Alternative, the campus would continue to operate as an educational facility but with an increased enrollment cap of 425 students. No change in land use would occur, and impacts would be less than significant.

Noise

Under the Retained Cottages Alternative, there would be unavoidable temporary noise associated with construction, but construction noise is exempted under LCF's Municipal Code when it occurs Monday through Friday between the hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. or on Saturday between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Project construction would occur during these hours. There may also be operational noise associated with tire squealing in the new parking structure. With incorporation of mitigation for tire squeal, as required for the proposed project, impacts of the Retained Cottages Alternative would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Public Services

Under the Retained Cottages Alternative, partial road closures have the potential to increase delays for emergency service responders in the area, but with implementation of a Traffic Management Plan, as required for the proposed project, impacts of the Retained Cottages Alternative would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Impacts on schools and surrounding parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant. Following construction, there would be no operational impacts on public services.

Transportation and Traffic

Under the Retained Cottages Alternative, the number of vehicle trips to and from the FSHA campus would increase as a result of increasing the enrollment cap to 425 students, but this increase would not result in significant impacts on traffic during construction or operation. Construction-period land closures and hazards related to the SCE subtransmission line and short-term parking impacts would be significant, but would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with incorporation of mitigation similar to that required for the proposed project.

Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy

Under the Retained Cottages Alternative, minor disruptions to utility services may occur, but such disruptions would be temporary and coordinated with school staff members and affected neighbors. Energy usage is expected to remain similar to existing conditions because the amount of energy consumed to light and heat the added square footage would be offset by the increased use of energy-

efficient fixtures and fittings. Any increases in energy would be slight, and impacts would be less than significant.

Achievement of Project Objectives

The Retained Cottages Alternative would meet most of the project objectives because it would modernize the campus while retaining historic features and blending new and old architecture. In addition, the alternative would centralize parking resources, similar to the proposed project. However, inclusion of the cottages would necessitate reconfiguration of parking and pedestrian access areas as well as improvements related to access under the ADA. Access to the upper campus from the new parking structure would require three elevators to be constructed (including an elevator at the parking structure that would go up one level above the top deck). In addition, two long bridges would travel a total of 52 feet horizontally from the top deck of the parking structure to the upper campus. The footprint of the Arts and Humanities Building would be adjusted to ensure adequate spacing between it and Cottages 1 and 2. These changes would not meet the project objective “to increase the functionality of the campus space and provide access throughout while respecting the natural hillside terrain” to the same extent as the proposed project. Also, the project objective “to modernize the FSHA campus by integrating ADA access and mobility standards into new improvements in a manner that establishes equivalent accessibility for all” would not be met to the same extent as it would be under the proposed project.

5.4.4 Relationship of Alternatives to Project Objectives

The No-Project Alternative would not revitalize and modernize the FSHA campus, nor would it consolidate or otherwise improve vehicular circulation in the area. In addition, under the No-Project Alternative, student enrollment would not increase to the desired level of 425 students. With the exception of retaining the integrity of the historic features of the campus, the No-Project Alternative would fail to realize the central motivation for the project, which is to modernize the campus in a way that meets educational and technological demands.

The Reduced Project Development Alternative would modernize the FSHA campus, albeit in a more limited way than the proposed project, relying more on remodeling rather than new construction. Remodeling efforts would be consistent, retaining the unique landscaping and architectural features of the campus while at the same time modifying facilities to meet current and future educational and technological needs. This alternative would also consolidate and centralize campus parking resources, as specified in the project objectives.

The Retained Cottages Alternative would necessitate reconfiguration of parking and pedestrian access areas as well as improvements related to access under the ADA. These changes would not meet the project objective “to increase the functionality of the campus space and provide access throughout while respecting the natural hillside terrain” to the same extent as the proposed project. Also, the project objective “to modernize the FSHA campus by integrating ADA access and mobility standards into new improvements in a manner that establishes equivalent accessibility for all” would not be met to the same extent as it would be under the proposed project.

5.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative

The alternatives analysis focuses on reducing the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project. The proposed project would result in only one potentially significant and unavoidable impact: demolition of Cottages 1 and 2, which would result in a significant impact on these historic buildings. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur. All other potentially significant impacts identified for the proposed project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures.

An EIR must identify the environmentally superior alternative. The No-Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project on the basis of minimizing or avoiding physical environmental impacts. However, the No-Project Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives. In addition, according to the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6(c)), if the environmentally superior alternative is the No-Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

A summary comparison of the potential impacts associated with the proposed project and its alternatives is provided in Table 5-1. This comparison indicates that the Retained Cottages Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative because it would eliminate the potential impacts on historic resources that could occur under the proposed project. This alternative would meet most of the objectives of the project; however, because of the difficulty posed with respect to meeting ADA requirements and improving the functionality of the campus, not all objectives would be met as fully as they would be under the proposed project.

Table 5-1: Comparison of Alternatives

Alternative Impacts	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Reduced Development	Alternative 3 Retained Cottages
<i>Aesthetics</i>			
Scenic Resources	NI	LTS	LTS
Visual Character and Quality	NI	LTS	LTS
Glare, Nighttime Lighting, and Shade/Shadow	NI	LTS	LTS
<i>Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>			
Air Quality Standards	NI	LTS (M)	LTS (M)
Criteria Pollutants	NI	LTS	LTS
Exposure of Sensitive Receptors	NI	LTS (M)	LTS (M)
Objectionable Odors	NI	LTS	LTS
Implementation of Applicable Air Quality Plan	NI	LTS	LTS
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	NI	LTS	LTS
Applicable Greenhouse Gas Plans, Policies, or Regulations	NI	LTS	LTS
<i>Cultural Resources</i>			
Built Environment Historic Resources	NI	SU	LTS (M)
Archaeological Resources	NI	LTS	LTS
Paleontological Resources	NI	NI	NI
<i>Geology and Soils</i>			
Seismic Hazards	NI	LTS	LTS
Slopes and Soil Stability	NI	LTS (M)	LTS (M)
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>			
Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials	NI	LTS	LTS
Airport Hazards	NI	NI	NI
Emergency Response	NI	LTS (M)	LTS (M)
Wildland Fires	NI	LTS	LTS
<i>Land Use and Planning</i>			
Physical Division of Community	NI	NI	NI
Conflicts with Land Use Plans	NI	NI	NI
Habitat Conservation Plans	NI	NI	NI
<i>Noise and Vibration</i>			
Exposure to or Generation of Noise Levels	NI	LTS	LTS
Exposure to or Generation of Groundborne Vibration	NI	LTS	LTS
Substantial Temporary Noise Increase	NI	LTS (M)	LTS (M)
Airport Noise	NI	NI	NI
<i>Transportation and Traffic</i>			
Roadway Segments	NI	LTS	LTS
Intersections	NI	LTS	LTS
Site Access	NI	LTS (M)	LTS (M)

Alternative Impacts	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Reduced Development	Alternative 3 Retained Cottages
Pedestrian and Bicycling Facilities	NI	LTS	LTS
Transit Service	NI	NI	NI
Safety	NI	LTS	LTS
Parking	NI	LTS (M)	LTS (M)
<i>Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy</i>			
Water and Wastewater Services	NI	LTS	LTS
Solid Waste Services	NI	LTS	LTS
Energy and Telecommunications Services	NI	LTS	LTS
Notes: NI: No Impact LTS: Less-than-Significant Impact LTS (M): Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation SU: Significant and Unavoidable Impact			