

## 5. ALTERNATIVES

### 5.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to assess a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project while avoiding or substantially lessening any of the significant impacts of the project and to evaluate the comparative merits of each alternative (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6). The *Guidelines* state that the selection of alternatives should be governed by a “rule of reason.” Not every conceivable alternative must be addressed, nor do infeasible alternatives need to be considered (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6[a]). When addressing feasibility, Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines* states, “among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries....”

Based on the *CEQA Guidelines*, several factors must be considered in determining the range of alternatives to be analyzed in an EIR and the level of analytical detail that should be provided for each alternative. These factors include (1) the nature of the significant impacts of the proposed project, (2) ability of alternatives to avoid or lessen the significant impacts associated with the project, (3) the ability of the alternatives to meet the objectives of the project, and (4) the feasibility of the alternatives.

CEQA also states that, “the EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project.” Generally, significant impacts of an alternative are discussed in this section, but in less detail than the proposed project, and should provide decision makers perspective as well as a reasoned choice regarding each alternative.

### 5.2 METHODOLOGY

The alternatives analysis is presented as a comparative analysis to the proposed project. This analysis compares the anticipated impacts of each alternative to the impacts associated with the proposed project; the discussion includes a determination as to whether or not each alternative would reduce, eliminate, or create new significant impacts. The following alternatives analysis compares the potential significant environmental impacts of the three alternatives with those of the proposed project for each of the environmental topics analyzed in Sections 4.1 through 4.7 (Environmental Impact Analysis) of the EIR.

#### 5.2.1 Selection of a Reasonable Range of Alternatives

Section 15126.6(c) of the *CEQA Guidelines* states: “The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from

detailed consideration in an EIR are (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.”

To determine what range of alternatives should be considered, the impacts identified for the proposed project were considered along with the project objectives. The proposed project is described in detail in Section 3, Project Description, and the potential environmental effects of the proposed project are analyzed in Sections 4.1 through 4.7.

### 5.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

To develop project alternatives, the EIR preparers considered the project objectives and reviewed the significant impacts in Section 4 to identify those significant impacts that could be avoided or reduced substantially through an alternative (refer to Table 5-5 at the end of this section).

The project’s objectives are to:

- Construct a new middle school campus near the existing campus in Hillsborough, California with appropriate academic and athletic facilities that can accommodate existing and projected enrollment.
- Design high-quality buildings with architectural features that blend with the natural setting, reduce the potential for glare, visual and sound impact from across the canyon, and are energy-efficient and sustainable.
- Create a pedestrian-friendly environment that minimizes auto/pedestrian conflicts and allows the academic areas to be separated from facilities that are open to the community.
- Reduce project-related vehicle trips by establishing a robust Transportation Demand Management Program.
- Provide a guaranteed revenue stream to the City.

### 5.4 SELECTED ALTERNATIVES

The following discussion is provided to meet the requirement of the *CEQA Guidelines* and provide the public and decision makers with information that will help them understand the significant impacts associated with the alternatives to the proposed project.

With the exception of traffic, all project impacts would be less than significant or would be mitigated to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. Therefore, alternatives were primarily chosen on their basis to potentially reduce or eliminate one or more of the project’s impacts on traffic. Three alternatives to the project were evaluated:

- **Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings.** Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings assumes that the existing buildings would undergo any necessary repairs and would be re-occupied with commercial/office and warehouse uses.
- **Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment.** Under Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment, buildings on the site would be demolished and the site would be redeveloped with uses as allowed under the current General Plan and zoning for the site.

Buildout under Alternative B could be to a floor area ratio (FAR) of up to 0.45<sup>1</sup> (meaning that on the 6.46 acre project site that up to approximately 127,000 square feet of commercial and office space could be constructed).

- **Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative.** Under Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative, the project would be constructed; however, enrollment at CSUS would be reduced by 25 percent.

#### 5.4.1 Alternatives Rejected as Being Infeasible

As described above, Section 15126.6(c) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires an EIR to identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination.

##### 5.4.1.1 Alternative Locations

The City considered alternative locations in the course of the alternatives analysis. The project is a private middle school located in the City of Belmont, requiring approximately 6.5 acres of land to accommodate the uses proposed. The City surveyed vacant and underutilized land uses in the City to find other potential locations for the school. Approximately 245 acres of land in the City are currently vacant and approximately 47 acres are underutilized.

Other than one site immediately adjacent to Ralston Avenue in the far western edge of the City, which is located in an area of steep, vegetation-covered canyon, there are no feasible sites in the San Juan Hills Plan Area. There are undeveloped sites in the Western Hills Plan Area that are zoned as HRO-3, which would allow for a private school. However, these sites are located in a hilly area that would require considerable grading and vegetation removal. Additionally, these sites would require access on streets either already carrying traffic from Tierra Linda Middle School, Carlmont High School, the Belmont Library, and commercial uses along Alameda de las Pulgas that intersect with Ralston Avenue; therefore, traffic impacts are not likely to be reduced or avoided by the project.

Underutilized parcels along El Camino Real near Davey Glen Road could be aggregated to accumulative acreage for the project; however, the sum of these parcels would be less than 4.5 acres in size, which would be too small to accommodate the proposed project. Therefore, sites along El Camino Real were deemed infeasible.

The other feasible parcels due to size and adjacent land uses include undeveloped parcels at Island Parkway and Concourse Place, adjacent to the Belmont Sports Complex. Together these parcels are 4.75 and 3.67 acres in size. Although these parcels would create a site large enough for the proposed project, they are owned by Oracle Corporation and are being land banked for future Oracle campus expansion. These parcels are not offered for sale and it is not reasonably foreseeable when they may be offered for sale. Therefore, alternative sites for the project are not available and a different location alternative was rejected as being infeasible.

---

<sup>1</sup> City of Belmont Zoning Ordinance, Section 5.7. 3. Amended by Ord. #470, 7/14/71; Ord. #477, 12/8/71; and by Ord. #790, 5/11/88.

### 5.4.1.2 Expanded TDM Program

The City also considered an increased TDM program that would increase the number of student arriving via shuttles and buses. CSUS currently proposes a comprehensive TDM program that uses buses, van shuttles, and carpools to reduce solo vehicle trips to and from the school. The proposed TDM program includes CSUS buses and van shuttles provided free of charge to transport approximately 100 students from the Hillsdale Caltrain station and various other locations in the morning and back again in the afternoon hours.

CSUS proposes, and would be required to meet a goal of approximately 70 student percent participation in the TDM program (meaning that approximately 70 percent of CSUS students must arrive by shuttle, van, or car pool), an ambitious goal. However, given the number of different variables, such as the wide geographic range from which the school draws, the large number of dual-working families with limited transportation flexibility, the challenges of entrusting young children to mass transit, and the coordination of siblings between the Belmont and Hillsborough campuses, the consultant concluded that achieving greater than 70 percent participation in a TDM program was unlikely to succeed and was deemed infeasible.

## 5.5 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Following is a description of each alternative, its anticipated environmental impacts, and a comparison of those impacts to the proposed project. The discussion includes a determination as to whether each alternative would reduce, eliminate, or create new significant impacts. Table 5-5, Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives, compares potential significant environmental impacts associated with Alternatives A, B, and C to the project.

Impacts to traffic from the alternatives have been analyzed for intersection level of service (LOS) and delay, vehicle queuing, and change in volume-to-capacity ratio at intersections where signals are warranted. In the interest of clarity and to best show the differences between project alternatives related to traffic impacts, this analysis is provided in 5.5.4 for all alternatives.

### 5.5.1 Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings

Under the No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings Alternative, the existing buildings would undergo any necessary repairs and be re-occupied with commercial and warehouse uses. No grading or major construction would take place on the site. Other than potential cosmetic changes to the buildings and potential removal of trees in poor health on the site, there would not be any real physical changes to the site under Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings. Re-occupation of the existing buildings with commercial/office and warehouse uses could generate up to approximately 237 employees on the site.

#### 5.5.1.1 Aesthetics

Under Alternative A, other than building improvements and potential landscaping changes there would be minimal changes to the project site. Views of the project site would potentially minimally change due to cosmetic changes on the site, but overall views of the project site from Davis Drive and surrounding areas would remain consistent with current conditions and there would be no new buildings or substantial changes to landscaping on the site. There would also be no change to lighting on the site.

Although there are no significant impacts on aesthetics resulting from the project, overall, impacts on aesthetics under Alternative A would be slightly less than under the project since the project site would remain unchanged.

#### ***5.5.1.2 Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions***

Under Alternative A, there would be no major construction activities on the project site. There would be some construction required to renovate the buildings; however, this construction would require less construction equipment, materials, and personnel. Because there would be less or more limited construction activities under Alternative A, air quality or greenhouse gas emissions from construction equipment and truck traffic would be reduced. Under Alternative A, there would be no construction that would expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations and this impact would be slightly less than under the project.

Although re-occupation of the buildings could generate up to 237 employees on the site, commercial/office and warehousing uses would generate fewer vehicle trips than the project. Therefore, impacts on air quality and greenhouse gas under Alternative A would be slightly less than under the project.

#### ***5.5.1.3 Biological Resources***

Under Alternative A, there would be no construction of buildings on the project site. Because no construction would occur, no ground disturbing activities, such as grading, fill, and/or excavation, would take place. Therefore, there would be no potential for construction activities to discharge any sediment to off-site jurisdictional waters. Vegetation on the site and in the vicinity is managed in coordination with the City of Belmont Fire Chief and the Director of Parks and Recreation. This management would continue under Alternative A and impacts to habitat removal would be slightly less than under the project, which includes a VMP and Defensible Space Plan. However, many of the trees on the site are in poor health. It is possible that during renovation and repair activities, similar to the project, there would be tree removal on the site that could affect migratory birds or bats.

Although all significant impacts on biological resources resulting from the project would be mitigated to less than significant, overall, impacts on biological resources under Alternative A would be slightly less than under the project since there would be no potential for construction run-off or habitat modification due to the VMP and Defensible Space Plan.

#### ***5.5.1.4 Land Use and Planning***

Under Alternative A, the project site would remain Commercial Office (CO) and Executive Office and Warehouse (E2.2) and there would be no construction or changes to the FAR on the site.

Although the project site would require a General Plan Amendment from Commercial Office (CO) to Institution (IN) and a rezoning from Executive Office and Warehouse (E2.2) to Planned District (PD), once the General Plan Amendment and rezoning are complete, the project uses would be consistent with land uses allowed under those designations and zones. However, under Alternative A, no General Plan Amendment or rezoning is necessary. Therefore, impacts on land use and planning under Alternative A would be slightly less than under the project.

### ***5.5.1.5 Noise***

Under Alternative A, there would be some noise generated by construction activities, but this noise would be less as the renovation would not require major construction activities. Therefore, the significant project impact from construction noise would be less under Alternative A. Under Alternative A there would be no construction vibration and this impact would be incrementally less than the project.

Although operational noise increases from the project would be less than significant, Alternative A would generate less traffic and there would be fewer activities on the site; therefore, impacts under Alternative A would be incrementally less than under the project. Impacts from exposure to airport noise by people using the project would be comparable to the project and less than significant. Overall, impacts under Alternative A would be less than under the project.

### ***5.5.1.6 Traffic and Transportation***

Under Alternative A, the vacant buildings would be re-occupied with up to 237 workers. Traffic under the No Project scenario is still expected to grow in the area and Alternative A would contribute to this growth by re-occupation of the buildings. Under Alternative A, No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings, impacts would be less than for the project for intersection level of service, queuing and change in v/c ratio at signal-warranted intersections.

Impacts to traffic from Alternative A for intersection level of service (LOS) and delay, vehicle queuing, and change in volume-to-capacity ratio at intersections where signals are warranted were analyzed. In the interest of clarity and to best show the differences between project alternatives related to traffic impacts, this analysis is provided in 5.5.4 for all alternatives. Please see 5.5.4 for a full analysis and comparison of Alternative A traffic impacts.

### ***5.5.1.7 Other Resource Topics***

Under the project, there would be no significant impacts to agriculture and forest resources, mineral resources, population and housing, and recreation. Additionally, under the project, impacts to cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, hydrology, public services, and utilities would be less than significant with the implementation of standard mitigation measures and regulatory requirements.

Under Alternative A, there would be no significant impacts to agriculture and forest resources, mineral resources, population and housing, and recreation and these impacts would be similar. Under Alternative A there would be no major construction activities; therefore, there would be incrementally reduced impacts to cultural resources, geology and soils, and hydrology. Although Alternative A would require construction activities that could require the demolition of some hazardous building materials, this impact would be incrementally less than under the project. Additionally, Alternative A would result in the re-occupation of the buildings. Overall, under Alternative A impacts would be similar as the project and less than significant for hazardous materials, public services, and utilities.

### ***5.5.1.8 Relationship of the Alternative to the Project Objectives***

Alternative A would not construct a new middle school campus near the existing CSUS campus in Hillsborough, California with appropriate academic and athletic facilities that can

accommodate existing and projected enrollment at CSUS. The existing buildings are not high quality, nor is the current environment pedestrian-friendly. Under State law, a TDM program could not be required for employees. However, Alternative A would provide a guaranteed property tax stream to the City. Therefore, Alternative A would not meet most of the project objectives.

## 5.5.2 Alternative B: 4- No Project/Redevelopment

Under Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment, buildings on the site would be demolished and the site would be redeveloped with uses as allowed under the current General Plan and zoning for the site. Buildout under Alternative B could be to a floor area ratio (FAR) of up to 0.45 (meaning that on the 6.46 acre project site that up to approximately 127,000 square feet of commercial and office space could be constructed). As with the project, grading and construction would take place on the site. Redevelopment of the buildings with office uses on the site to the permitted FAR could result in up to approximately 426 employees on the site.

### 5.5.2.1 Aesthetics

Under Alternative B, the site would be redeveloped with other commercial uses. Although Alternative B would result in construction of new buildings and potential landscaping changes, overall the site would remain as a developed commercial site. However, views of the project site would change due to the increase in FAR and, therefore, building square footage and development density on the site. This change in development density could result in an increase in light and glare emanating from the site.

Although there are no significant impacts on aesthetics resulting from the project, overall, impacts on aesthetics under Alternative B would be greater than under the project since the project site would be redeveloped with an increased development density and could generate more light and glare.

### 5.5.2.2 Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under Alternative B, there would be major construction activities on the project site. Construction of a larger development on the site would require more construction equipment, materials, and personnel and likely for a longer duration than for the project. Because there would be more construction activities under Alternative B, air quality or greenhouse gas emissions from construction equipment and truck traffic would be increased from the project. Under Alternative B, there would be increased construction that would expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations and this impact would be slightly more than under the project.

Redevelopment of the buildings with office uses on the site to the permitted FAR could result in up to approximately 426 employees on the site. Alternative B would generate similar or slightly more vehicle trips than the project. Therefore, impacts on air quality and greenhouse gas under Alternative A would be slightly more than under the project.

### ***5.5.2.3 Biological Resources***

Under Alternative B, there would be construction of buildings on the project site. Similar to the project, this construction would result in ground disturbing activities, such as grading, fill, and/or excavation. Therefore, there would be the same potential for construction activities to discharge any sediment to off-site jurisdictional waters. Vegetation on the site and in the vicinity is managed in coordination with the City of Belmont Fire Chief and the Director of Parks and Recreation. The new project would require preparation and implementation of a VMP and Defensible Space Plan. Similar to the project, Alternative B would require tree removal on the site that could affect migratory birds or bats.

Although all significant impacts on biological resources resulting from the project would be mitigated to less than significant, overall, impacts on biological resources under Alternative B would be the same as under the project since there would be similar grading, tree removal, and construction activities.

### ***5.5.2.4 Land Use and Planning***

Under Alternative B, the project site would remain Commercial Office (CO) and Executive Office and Warehouse (E2.2) and no General Plan Amendment or rezoning is required. Buildings on the site would be demolished and the site would be redeveloped with uses as allowed under the current General Plan and zoning for the site. Buildout under Alternative B could be to a floor area ratio (FAR) of up to 0.45 (meaning that on the 6.46 acre project site that up to approximately 127,000 square feet of commercial and office space could be constructed). This FAR would be consistent with the allowed FAR for the site. Therefore, impacts on land use and planning under Alternative B would be the same as under the project.

### ***5.5.2.5 Noise***

Under Alternative B, there would be noise generated by construction activities. This noise could potentially be increased from the project due to the increased buildout on the site. Therefore, this impact would be greater under Alternative B. Operation increases from the project would be less than significant and impacts under Alternative B would potentially be less since the commercial office buildings do not include any sports field.

Under Alternative B there would be construction vibration impacts. Similar to construction noise, this impact would be more than under the project due to the increase in building foundation construction. Impacts from exposure to airport noise by people using the project would be comparable to the project and less than significant. Overall, impacts under Alternative B would be greater than under the project.

### ***5.5.2.6 Traffic and Transportation***

Under Alternative B, up to 127,000 square feet of commercial and office space would be constructed, resulting in more employees on the site. Under Alternative B, No Project/Redevelopment, impacts would be close to the same or greater than for the project for intersection level of service, queuing and change in v/c ratio at signal-warranted intersections.

Impacts to traffic from Alternative B for intersection level of service (LOS) and delay, vehicle queuing, and change in volume-to-capacity ratio at intersections where signals are warranted

were analyzed. In the interest of clarity and to best show the differences between project alternatives related to traffic impacts, this analysis is provided in 5.5.4 for all alternatives. Please see 5.5.4 for a full analysis and comparison of Alternative B traffic impacts.

#### ***5.5.2.7 Other Resource Topics***

Under the project, there would be no significant impacts to agriculture and forest resources, mineral resources, population and housing, and recreation. Additionally, under the project, impacts to cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, hydrology, public services, and utilities would be less than significant with the implementation of standard mitigation measures and regulatory requirements.

Under Alternative B, similar to the project, there would be no significant impacts to agriculture and forest resources, or mineral resources. However, there would be an increase in working population on the site, which could result in an increase in population. This increase in population could generate a slight increase in housing and recreation needs in the City over the project.

Under Alternative B there would be major construction activities; therefore, there would be similar impacts to cultural resources, geology and soils, and hydrology. Alternative B would require construction activities that could require the demolition of hazardous building materials. Additionally, Alternative B would result in the construction of buildings with a greater FAR and therefore an increased working population, need for housing, public services, water usage, and wastewater generation. Therefore, public service and utilities impacts from the project would likely be increased under Alternative B.

#### ***5.5.2.8 Relationship of the Alternative to the Project Objectives***

Alternative B would not construct a new middle school campus near the existing CSUS campus in Hillsborough, California with appropriate academic and athletic facilities that can accommodate existing and projected CSUS enrollment and, under State law, the City could not impose a mandatory TDM program on employees. The project could, however, be designed with high-quality buildings, could create a pedestrian-friendly environment, and would provide a significant property tax revenue stream to the City. Therefore, Alternative B would meet some of the project objectives.

### **5.5.3 Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative**

Under Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative, the project would be constructed; however, enrollment at CSUS would be reduced by 25 percent by 25 percent (60 students) for a total enrollment of 180 students.

#### ***5.5.3.1 Aesthetics***

Under Alternative C, the site would be redeveloped with the CSUS campus facilities. Similar to the project, the site would be redeveloped with school uses and overall the site would remain as a developed site. The same site plan would be constructed and views of the project site would remain the same as under the project. Light and glare emanating from the site would be the same as under the project.

There are no significant impacts on aesthetics resulting from the project and impacts on aesthetics under Alternative C would be the same as under the project.

### ***5.5.3.2 Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions***

Under Alternative C, there would be the same amount of construction activities on the project site, requiring the same amount of construction equipment, materials, and personnel. Because there would be the same construction activities under Alternative C, air quality or greenhouse gas emissions from construction equipment and truck traffic would be the same. Under Alternative C, there would be construction that would expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations and this impact would be the same as under the project.

Alternative C would generate the same or slightly fewer vehicle trips than the project. Therefore, impacts on air quality and greenhouse gas under Alternative C would be slightly less than under the project.

### ***5.5.3.3 Biological Resources***

Under Alternative C, the CSUS campus would be constructed and there would be construction of buildings on the project site. Similar to the project, this construction would result in ground disturbing activities, such as grading, fill, and/or excavation. Therefore, there would be the same potential for construction activities to discharge any sediment to off-site jurisdictional waters. Vegetation on the site and in the vicinity is managed in coordination with the City of Belmont Fire Chief and the Director of Parks and Recreation. The new project would require preparation and implementation of a VMP and Defensible Space Plan. Similar to the project, Alternative C would require tree removal on the site that could affect migratory birds or bats.

Although all significant impacts on biological resources resulting from the project would be mitigated to less than significant, overall, impacts on biological resources under Alternative C would be the same as under the project since there would be similar grading, tree removal, and construction activities.

### ***5.5.3.4 Land Use and Planning***

Similar to the project, Alternative C would require a General Plan Amendment from Commercial Office (CO) to Institution (IN) and a rezoning from Executive Office and Warehouse (E2.2) to Planned District (PD). Similar to the project no division of community or conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan would occur. Therefore, impacts on land use and planning under Alternative C would be the same as under the project.

### ***5.5.3.5 Noise***

Under Alternative C, there would be temporary noise generated during project construction activities from construction equipment. Although construction noise from the project would be less than significant, this impact would be similar under Alternative C. Additionally, operational noise increases from project related traffic would be less than significant and impacts under Alternative C would be similar.

Under Alternative C there would be comparable construction vibration impacts. In addition, under Alternative C construction and operational noise would be like that of the project. Overall, noise impacts under Alternative C would be comparable to the project.

#### ***5.5.3.6 Traffic and Transportation***

Under Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative, enrollment at CSUS would total 180 students. Under Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment, impacts would be the same or less than for the project for intersection level of service, queuing and change in v/c ratio at signal-warranted intersections.

Impacts to traffic from Alternative C for intersection level of service (LOS) and delay, vehicle queuing, and change in volume-to-capacity ratio at intersections where signals are warranted were analyzed. In the interest of clarity and to best show the differences between project alternatives related to traffic impacts, this analysis is provided in 5.5.4 for all alternatives. Please see 5.5.4 for a full analysis of Alternative C traffic impacts.

#### ***5.5.3.7 Other Resource Topics***

Under the project, there would be no significant impacts to agriculture and forest resources, mineral resources, population and housing, and recreation. Additionally, under the project, impacts to cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, hydrology, public services, and utilities would be less than significant with the implementation of standard mitigation measures and regulatory requirements.

Under Alternative C, there would be the same major construction activities; therefore, there would be the same impacts to cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, and hydrology. However, there would be fewer students under Alternative C; therefore, impacts to public services and utilities would be reduced. However, overall impacts to these resource areas under Alternative C impacts would be similar as the project and incrementally less for public services and utilities.

#### ***5.5.3.8 Relationship of the Alternative to the Project Objectives***

Alternative C would construct a new middle school campus with appropriate academic and athletic facilities, could be designed with high-quality buildings in a pedestrian-friendly environment, and could include a TDM program. However, Alternative C would not accommodate existing and projected CSUS enrollment and would be exempt from property taxes. Therefore, Alternative C would partially meet the project objectives.

### **5.5.4 Alternatives A, B, and C Traffic and Transportation Impact Analysis**

The alternatives were analyzed for impacts to intersection level of service (LOS) and delay, vehicle queuing, and change in volume-to-capacity ratio at intersections where signals are warranted. The analysis focuses on locations with significant impacts due to the project, and includes weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic impacts; the midday time period has not been analyzed for all alternatives due to the absence of a distinctive midday traffic peak period for warehouse and commercial office land uses.

Tables 5-1 through 5-3 provide volumes for each alternative. For all alternatives, Tables 5-4 and 5-5 provide analysis results for intersection level of service and delay and Tables 5-6 and 5-7 provide analysis results for vehicle queuing. See Appendix H1, Transportation Alternatives Analysis, Tables 5-8 and 5-9 for tables providing the details on change in volume-to-capacity ratio at intersections where signals are warranted.

As shown in Table 5-1, under Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings, there would be a projected 91 inbound and 13 outbound AM peak hour trips, and 17 inbound and 82 outbound PM peak hour trips.

**Table 5-1: Alternative A Trip Generation**

Use	SF	AM Peak Hour Trips				PM Peak Hour Trips			
		Inbound		Outbound		Inbound		Outbound	
		Rate	Vol	Rate	Vol	Rate	Vol	Rate	Vol
Warehouse	22,536	0.24	6	0.06	1	0.08	2	0.24	5
General Office	61,964	1.37	85	0.19	12	0.25	15	1.24	77
<b>Total</b>			<b>91</b>		<b>13</b>		<b>17</b>		<b>82</b>

Trip rate source: Trip Generation, 9th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2012.

Source: Compiled by Crane Transportation Group

Under Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment, as shown in Table 5-2, there would be a projected 175 inbound and 24 outbound AM peak hour trips, and 32 inbound and 158 outbound PM peak hour trips.

**Table 5-2: Alternative B Trip Generation**

Use	SF	AM Peak Hour Trips				PM Peak Hour Trips			
		Inbound		Outbound		Inbound		Outbound	
		Rate	Vol	Rate	Vol	Rate	Vol	Rate	Vol
General Office	127,700	1.37	175	0.19	24	0.25	32	1.24	158
<b>Total</b>			<b>175</b>		<b>24</b>		<b>32</b>		<b>158</b>

Trip rate source: Trip Generation, 9th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2012.

Source: Compiled by Crane Transportation Group

Under Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment, as shown in Table 5-3, there would be a projected 96 inbound and 86 outbound AM peak hour trips, and 42 inbound and 97 outbound PM peak hour trips.

**Table 5-3: Alternative C Trip Generation**

Use	SF	AM Peak Hour Trips				PM Peak Hour Trips			
		Inbound		Outbound		Inbound		Outbound	
		Rate	Vol	Rate	Vol	Rate	Vol	Rate	Vol
CSUS Project	**	**	96	**	86	**	42	**	97
<b>Total</b>			<b>96</b>		<b>86</b>		<b>42</b>		<b>97</b>

Trip rate source: Trip Generation, 9th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2012.

Source: Compiled by Crane Transportation Group

### Summary Comparison of Alternatives Versus the Project

Each of the three alternatives would result in a similar range of significant impacts to intersection levels of service and delay, peak hour queues, and increases in v/c ratios at signal warranted intersections—the differences are in the slightly differing measured amount of impact at each location, for each alternative.

A comparison of intersection levels of service and delay, peak hour queues, and increases in v/c ratios at signal-warranted intersections are shown in Tables 5-4 through 5-9. In summary:

**Under Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings**, overall impacts, although still significant, would be less than for the project for intersection level of service, queuing and change in v/c ratio at signal-warranted intersections. Alternative A would result in an improvement to v/c ratio as compared to the project at one location: the Ralston Avenue/ Notre Dame Avenue intersection, where there would be no measurable change in v/c ratio due to traffic from Alternative A (at this intersection, the project would result in a 0.1 change in v/c ratio).

**Under Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment**, impacts would be close to the same or greater than for the project for intersection level of service, queuing and change in v/c ratio at signal-warranted intersections.

**Under Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment**, impacts would be the same or less than for the project for intersection level of service, queuing and change in v/c ratio at signal-warranted intersections.

**Table 5-4: Existing Plus Project and Future Plus Project Intersection LOS & Delay AM Peak Hour**

Int. #	Intersection	Existing + Project AM				Future + Project AM			
		Project	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Project	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C
3	Ralston Ave / South Rd	F 228.4	F 219.6	F 226.7	F 224.6	F 319.0	F 310.0	F 317.0	F 315.0
12	Ralston Ave / Tahoe Drive	E 38.0	E 35.4	D 33.9	D 34.7	B 10.2	B 10.0	B 10.3	B 10.0

Notes: Intersection delay, LOS, and v/c ratios calculated with Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000 methodology using Synchro software.

Source: Compiled by Crane Transportation Group

**Table 5-5: Existing Plus Project and Future Plus Project Intersection LOS & Delay PM Peak Hour**

Int. #	Intersection	Existing + Project PM				Future + Project PM			
		Project	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Project	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C
3	Ralston Ave / South Rd	F 137.0	F 132.1	F 137.2	F 134.6	F 170.0	F 165.0	F 170.0	F 168.0
12	Ralston Ave / Tahoe Drive	F 61.8	F 55.9	F 60.5	F 58.5	A 7.5	A 7.5	A 7.5	A 7.5

Notes: Intersection delay, LOS, and v/c ratios calculated with Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000 methodology using Synchro software.

Source: Compiled by Crane Transportation Group

**Table 5-6: Existing Plus Project and Future Plus Project Intersection LOS & Delay  
PM Peak Hour**

#	Intersection Name	Movement	Peak Period	Storage Length (ft)	Base Case Vehicle Queue Length (ft)	With-Project Vehicle Queue Length (ft)/ Exceeds Base Vehicle Queue Length by:			
						Project	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C
4	Ralston Avenue / Notre Dame Univ. Driveway	SBR	MD	50	527	554/ 27 feet (2 veh)	N/A	N/A	549/ 22 (1 veh)
9	Ralston Avenue/ Davis Drive	NBL	AM	50	102	177/ 75 feet (3 veh)	111/ 9 feet (1 veh)	118/ 16 feet (1 veh)	160/ 58 feet (3 veh)
			MD		45	78/ 33 feet (2 veh)	N/A	N/A	70/ 25 feet (1 veh)
			PM		61	129/ 68 feet (3 veh)	102/ 41 feet (2 veh)	142/ 81 feet (2 veh)	111/ 50 feet (2 veh)
		WBL	AM	65	76	129/ 53 feet (2 veh)	113/ 37 feet (2 veh)	146/ 70 feet (1 veh)	114/ 38 feet (2 veh)
			MD		65	91/ 26 feet (2 veh)	N/A	N/A	83/ 18 (1 veh)

Notes: Intersection delay, LOS, and v/c ratios calculated with Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000 methodology using Synchro software.

Source: Compiled by Crane Transportation Group

**Table 5-7: Summary of Vehicle Queuing  
Existing + Project**

#	Intersection Name	Movement	Peak Period	Storage Length (ft)	Base Case Vehicle Queue Length (ft)	With-Project Vehicle Queue Length (ft)/ Exceeds Base Vehicle Queue Length by:			
						Project	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C
4	Ralston Avenue / Notre Dame University Driveway	SBR	AM	50	416	449/ 33 feet (2 veh)	439/ 23 (1 veh)	449/ 33 feet (2 veh)	445/ 29 feet (2 veh)
			PM		317	331/ 14 feet (1 veh)	324/ 7 feet (1 veh)	331/ 14 feet (1 veh)	328/ 11 feet (1 veh)
9	Ralston Avenue/ Davis Drive	NBL	AM	50	108	185/ 77 feet (3 veh)	116/ 8 feet (1 veh)	125/ 17 feet (1 veh)	168/ 60 feet (3 veh)
			MD		45	78/ 33 feet (2 veh)	N/A	N/A	70/ 25 feet (1 veh)
			PM		88	157/ 69 feet (3 veh)	129/ 41 feet (2 veh)	170/ 82 feet (4 veh)	140/ 52 feet (3 veh)
		WBL	AM	65	91	148/ 57 feet (3 veh)	127/ 36 feet (2 veh)	161/ 70 feet (3 veh)	132/ 41 feet (2 veh)
			MD		65	97/ 32 feet (2 veh)	N/A	N/A	88/ 23 (1 veh)

Notes: Intersection delay, LOS, vehicle queues and v/c ratios calculated with Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000 methodology using Synchro software.

Source: Compiled by Crane Transportation Group

**Comparison of Alternative A versus Alternative C**

A comparison of Alternative A versus Alternative C, both of which would result in overall less impact compared to the project, reveals:

- **LOS/delay and change in v/c ratio at signal warranted intersections:** Alternative A would result in overall less delay at analyzed intersections and less increase in v/c ratios at signal-warranted intersections.
- **Queues at Intersections:** Depending upon the intersection movement, in some instances Alternative A produces less queuing impact at analyzed intersections, and in other cases Alternative C results in less queuing impact.

### 5.5.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative

As described in 5.1 and 5.2.1, Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines* governs the consideration and discussion of alternatives to the proposed project. CEQA requires that an EIR select the “environmentally superior” alternative and disclose the reasons for its selection as such. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the one that would be expected to generate the fewest significant impacts. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative is an informational procedure and the alternative selected may not be the alternative that best meets the goals or needs of the applicant or the lead agency.

The project would result in significant impacts on air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and transportation. Table 5-8 summarizes all the environmental impact analysis of the proposed project and shows whether the alternatives’ impacts would be lesser, similar, or greater than the proposed project (assumes the implementation of mitigation measures, if required). The table provides a comparison of the alternatives’ ability to avoid or substantially reduce the project’s impacts.

Alternative A: No Project/No Build Alternative would not result in any ground-disturbing activities or new building construction, which would avoid the project’s significant air quality, biology, cultural resource, and construction noise impacts. Alternative A would result in lesser impacts to study intersections due to its lower overall volumes at each study intersection. However, traffic from this alternative would still result in significant impacts at most of the same locations as the project. Additionally, Alternative A would fail to meet most of the project objectives.

Alternative B and C both propose construction. Therefore, impacts to air quality, biology, cultural resource, and construction noise would be incrementally greater for Alternative B, which proposes a greater amount of building construction and similar to the project for Alternative C.

Alternative B would result in an increase of FAR on the project site. Therefore, Alternative B would result in an increase in people on the site. Traffic impacts would be similar or greater than the project for intersection level of service, queuing and change in v/c ratio at signal-warranted intersections. Alternative B would meet some of the project objectives.

Alternative C would result in fewer people on the site than the project. Therefore, impacts from traffic would be the same or incrementally less than the project for intersection level of service, queuing and change in v/c ratio at signal-warranted intersections. Alternative C would partially meet the project objectives.

Although both Alternative A and C would reduce the intensity of the project impacts on transportation, the decrease in trips would not be enough to substantially reduce or eliminate the impacts of the project. As shown in 5.5.4 and Table 5-8, the alternatives would have similar,

fewer, and greater impacts as compared to the project. Therefore, there are environmental advantages and disadvantages of each alternative in comparison with the project. While Alternative C does not eliminate any unmitigated significant impacts, because it would result in fewer trips, it is the environmentally superior alternative to the project.

*This page intentionally left blank*

**Table 5-8: Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives**

Environmental Issue Area	Project	Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings	Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment	Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative
<i>Aesthetics</i>				
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcropping, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	LTS	—	+	=
Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	LTS	—	+	=
<i>Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>				
Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan policies?	LTS	—	+	=
Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	LTS	—	+	=
Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	LTS	—	+	=
Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations resulting in cancer and noncancer risks? (Operation)	LTS	=	=	=
Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations resulting in cancer and noncancer risks? (Construction)	LTS/M	—	+	=
Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	LTS	=	=	=

**Table 5-8: Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives**

Environmental Issue Area	Project	Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings	Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment	Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative
Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	LTS	—	=	=
Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	LTS	—	=	=
<i>Biological Resources</i>				
Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	LTS	=	=	=
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	LTS/M	—	=	=
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	LTS/M	—	=	=
Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	LTS/M	=	=	=

**Table 5-8: Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives**

Environmental Issue Area	Project	Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings	Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment	Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative
<i>Cultural Resources</i>				
Would the project direct impacts on an architectural resource or historic setting?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project adversely affect expected prehistoric site deposits?	LTS/M	—	=	=
Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	LTS/M	—	=	=
Would the project adversely affect unidentified paleontological resources?	LTS/M	—	=	=
<i>Geology/Soils</i>				
Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides.?	NI/LTS	—	=	=
Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	LTS	—	=	=
Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	LTS	—	=	=
Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: strong seismic ground shaking; or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	LTS	—	=	=
Would the project be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property?	LTS	—	=	=

**Table 5-8: Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives**

Environmental Issue Area	Project	Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings	Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment	Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative
Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for disposal of wastewater?	NI	=	=	=
<i>Hazards/Hazardous Materials</i>				
Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	LTS	=	=	=
Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	LTS	—	=	=
Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	NI	=	=	=
For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	NI	=	=	=
For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	LTS	=	=	=

**Table 5-8: Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives**

Environmental Issue Area	Project	Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings	Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment	Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative
Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	LTS	=	=	=
<i>Hydrology/Water Quality</i>				
Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	LTS	=	=	=
Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	LTS	=	=	=
Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate	NI	=	=	=

**Table 5-8: Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives**

<b>Environmental Issue Area</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings</b>	<b>Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment</b>	<b>Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative</b>
Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project cause inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	NI	=	=	=
<i>Land Use</i>				
Would the project physically divide an established community?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	LTS	=	=	=
Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	LTS	=	=	=
<i>Noise</i>				
Would the project expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	LTS	—	+	=
Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	LTS	=	=	=
Would the project expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	LTS/M	—	+	=

**Table 5-8: Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives**

Environmental Issue Area	Project	Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings	Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment	Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative
Would the project for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public private airport or airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	LTS	=	=	=
<i>Population and Housing</i>				
Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	LTS	=	+	=
Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	NI	=	=	=
Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	NI	=	=	=
<i>Public Services and Utilities</i>				
Would the project result in would not result in the need for new or physically altered police facilities?	LTS	—	+	=
Would the project result in would not result in the need for new or physically altered firefighting or emergency facilities?	LTS	—	+	=
Would the project result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of school services and the need for new or physically altered school facilities?	NI	=	+	=
Would the project result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the need for new or physically altered public facilities?	NI	—	+	=
Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements?	LTS	—	+	=
Would the project result in the need for new water or wastewater facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental	LTS	—	+	=

**Table 5-8: Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives**

Environmental Issue Area	Project	Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings	Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment	Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative
effect?				
Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effect?	LTS	—	+	=
Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	LTS	—	+	=
Would the project result in the need for new water or wastewater facilities or the determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	LTS	—	+	=
Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs and comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	NI	=	+	=
<i>Transportation</i>				
Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	SU	= or —	= or +	= or —

**Table 5-8: Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives**

Environmental Issue Area	Project	Alternative A: No Project/Re-Occupation of the Existing Buildings	Alternative B: No Project/Redevelopment	Alternative C: Reduced Enrollment Alternative
Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	SU	= or —	= or +	= or —
Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risk?	LTS	=	=	=
Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	LTS	=	=	=
Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	LTS	=	=	=
Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	LTS	=	=	=
<b>Key:</b> <b>NI</b> = No Impact <b>LTS</b> = Less-than-Significant Impact <b>LTS/M</b> = Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures <b>SU</b> = Significant and Unavoidable <b>+</b> = Impact greater than the project <b>=</b> = Impact similar to the project <b>—</b> = Impact less than the project				

*This page intentionally left blank*