VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

A. INTRODUCTION

The following discussion evaluates alternatives to the proposed project and examines the potential environmental impacts associated with each alternative. Through comparison of these alternatives to the proposed project, the relative environmental advantages and disadvantages of each are weighed and analyzed. The CEQA Guidelines require that the range of alternatives addressed in an EIR 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]). Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines states that the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, or other plans or regulatory limitations, and jurisdictional boundaries. Section 15126.6(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the discussion of alternatives must focus on alternatives capable of either avoiding or substantially lessening any significant environmental effects of the project, even if the alternative would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly. The alternatives discussion should not consider alternatives whose implementation is remote or speculative, and the analysis need not be presented in the same level of detail as the assessment of the project.

Based on the CEQA Guidelines, several factors need to be considered in determining the range of alternatives to be analyzed in the 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) the 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. The analysis in this EIR indicates that the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to historic resources, and construction-related noise. Thus, the alternatives examined herein represent alternatives that would minimize or avoid the significant historic and construction-related noise impacts associated with implementation of the project.

B. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

The alternatives to be analyzed in comparison to the proposed project include:

> Alternative 1: No Project/Existing Conditions Alternative: Under this alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed, and the project site would remain in its current condition. The analysis assumes conditions of the site at the time the Notice of Preparation was published (December 26, 2003). There would be no modification or rehabilitation of the buildings, and no new construction would occur.
>
> Alternative 2: Reduced Density Alternative: Under this alternative, the existing structures and the Historic Monument (Tower of Wooden Pallets) present on the site would be demolished and

a 78 unit apartment structure would be developed under the existing allowable site density. This alternative would not exercise a density bonus and, therefore, would not include the provision of 5 units designated as "affordable disable housing."

C. ALTERNATIVES REJECTED AS INFEASIBLE

Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs 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. The following discussion describes alternatives that were considered, but were found to be infeasible.

Alternative Site: An alternative site for the proposed project was considered to reduce the significant and unavoidable project impact to historic resources that would result from demolition of the Cultural-Historic Monument No. 184, "Tower of Wooden Pallets." However, an alternative site was rejected as being infeasible because the applicant does not own and cannot feasibly obtain other property in the community that is zoned for multi-family housing.

Restoration/Preservation Alternative: An alternative involving the restoration and preservation of the Historic Monument on the project site was considered to reduce the significant and unavoidable project impact to historic resources that would result from the demolition of the Cultural-Historic Monument No. 184, "Tower of Wooden Pallets." However, this alternative was rejected as infeasible due to the advanced state of deterioration of the Historic Monument (refer to Section IV.D, Cultural Resources) and the inaccessibility of the Historic Monument as a result of the debris and trash on the project site. The Historic Monument consists of approximately 2,000 wooden fork-lift truck pallets laid on top of one another in a brick-like fashion; the pallets sit directly on the earth and are not attached to one another. The physical integrity of the Tower has been evaluated by two structural engineers who found that the wood exposed to the elements in the Tower is weathered, dry-rotted, and termite-infested; the wood has diminished or totally lost its structural properties. All elements are essentially loose; nails and pin rivets are oxidized and loose and the connectors remaining can be removed by hand without any effort. The Historic Monument was not built in accordance with the City of Los Angeles Building Code, and its design and the materials it was constructed from were not intended for structural longevity. For these reasons, restoration and preservation of the Historic Monument would not be possible, and therefore this alternative was rejected as infeasible.

D. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the proposed project are:

- To create a multi-family residential development consistent with the goals and purposes of the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan including increasing available housing stock.
- To increase the supply of housing in the City by taking advantage of allowable density and build out the site to allowable densities in an appropriately designed integrated project.
- To provide needed affordable housing for disabled persons.
- To promote a jobs/housing balance by locating attractive new market-rate and affordable housing in proximity to employment centers and mass transit.
- To provide housing in close proximity to commercial areas and mass transit.
- To provide the project's residents with a safe, well-lit, high-quality modern residential building complete with amenities such as a spa and swimming pool.

E. ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The anticipated means for implementation of the alternatives can influence the assessment and/or probability of impacts for those alternatives. For example, a project may have the potential to generate impacts, but considerations in project design may also afford the opportunity to avoid or reduce such impacts. The alternatives analysis is presented as a comparative analysis to the proposed project, and assumes that all applicable mitigation measures proposed for the project would apply to each alternative. Impacts associated with the alternatives are compared to project-related impacts and are classified as greater, less, or essentially similar to (or comparable to) the level of impacts associated with the proposed project.

The following alternatives analysis compares the potential environmental impacts of two alternatives with those of the proposed project for each of the environmental topics analyzed in detail in Section IV (Environmental Impact Analysis) of the EIR.

1. ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

As required by CEQA, this subsection analyzes a "No Project" Alternative. Under this alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed and the project site would remain in its current condition. The unavoidable and significant impacts of the project on historic resources and construction noise would be avoided. The project site is currently occupied by several derelict buildings and Los Angeles Cultural-Historic Monument No. 184, "Tower of Wooden Pallets," the site is not maintained and is overgrown with weeds and littered with trash and debris. There would be no modification or

rehabilitation of the buildings, no clearance of the garbage on-site, and no new construction would occur.

Analysis of Environmental Impacts

The analysis of this alternative assumes the continuation of existing conditions, as well as the development of the related projects described in Section II.B (Related Projects). The potential environmental impacts associated with this alternative are described below and are compared to the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.

Visual Resources

Under this alternative, the project site structures and the Cultural-Historic Monument would not be demolished. Existing views of the project site would not change. However, the site would remain unimproved and in a state of neglect and disrepair; overgrown and littered with debris and trash. Whilst impacts under this alternative relating to visual character of the site and aesthetics and visual character of the site vicinity would be less than significant, impacts would be potentially greater than those associated with the proposed project's less than significant impacts as the current state of neglect would continue; therefore, degrading the visual character of the site and area.

There are no natural features within the project area. Views of the Santa Monica Mountains are afforded from Sepulveda Boulevard, traveling south and views of the Santa Susana Mountains are visible from Sepulveda Blvd. traveling north. However, along Magnolia Boulevard, the mountains are mostly obstructed by trees and intervening topography and buildings. Under this alternative, these views would continue to be obstructed by trees and intervening topography and buildings along Magnolia Blvd. and the project site boundary. Therefore, impacts to valued views or viewsheds would not be significant under this alternative. This alternative's impact on valued views would be similar to those associated with the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Currently, the project site buildings have wood sidings or are constructed from unfinished wood, which do not create any glare. Under this alternative, glare would not be created as the buildings would remain in this state. Impacts would be similar to the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Air Quality

No grading or construction would occur under this alternative, and no new vehicle trips would be generated. No air pollutant emissions (i.e., PM_{10}, CO, NO_X) related to short-term grading and construction would be generated under this alternative. There would be no short-term construction impacts as the site would remain in its current condition and short-term construction impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project's less than significant impacts. Operationally,

this alternative would have no stationary and mobile source emissions because the site would continue to be vacant. Operational impacts of this alternative would be less than significant and less than the proposed project's less than significant impact.

Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, no new construction or physical modifications would occur on the project site. While the Cultural-Historic Monument on the project site is not eligible for listing in the National or California Registers of Historic Place, the Tower of Wooden Pallets was designated a Monument by the City of Los Angeles in 1978. Demolition of the Monument would result in a significant impact under CEQA as there would be a permanent loss of an historic resource. Implementation of this alternative would not impact the Los Angeles Cultural-Historic Monument No. 184, and impacts to historic resources would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project's significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources would be avoided with implementation of this alternative.

Although unlikely, subsurface archaeological and paleontological deposits could potentially exist beneath existing structures, asphalt or landscaped areas. However, this alternative would not include grading and excavation activities and, thus, any deposits would remain unexcavated in the soils. Therefore, the less than significant impacts of the proposed project would be avoided by this alternative because there would be no potential for the disturbance of subsurface resources.

Geology and Soils

This alternative would not involve any grading or construction. No geologic, soil erosion and/or sedimentation impacts that are typically associated with grading and construction would occur from this alternative. Therefore, soil erosion and sedimentation impacts associated with this alternative would not be significant and would be less than the proposed project's less than significant impact.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

If no project is undertaken, there would be no demolition or construction activities. As a result, there would be no potential for short-term exposure to potentially hazardous materials and/or lead-based paint materials contained in the existing structures or the debris on the project site. Therefore, because there would be no construction activities, hazardous materials impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would not involve any grading or construction. No new impermeable surfaces (e.g. buildings and driveways) would be constructed under this alternative. Thus no increases in surface

water runoff rates or velocities would occur. Therefore, this alternative would not result in any significant impacts related to the amount or rate of stormwater runoff or drainage system effects, and surface hydrology impacts associated with this alternative would be less than those associated with the proposed project's less than significant impacts. Under existing conditions, runoff from the project site may contain urban pollutants such as automotive fluids, heavy metals and chemical constituents, fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides that could be discharged into the storm drainage system. Therefore, operational water quality impacts associated with this alternative are unlikely to comply with the requirements of NPDES Permit No. CA0061654 and may be greater than the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Noise

Since no additional units would be created, no additional traffic would be generated under this alternative. There would be no construction activities associated with this alternative and impacts related to construction would be less than significant and less than the proposed project's significant impacts. Also, there would be no increase in noise levels typically associated with the long-term operation of a new, larger development and impacts would not be significant. As such, long-term noise impacts would be less than significant and less than those associated with the proposed project's less than significant operational noise impacts.

Population and Housing

This alternative would not involve any new development or housing. This alternative would not change the existing population on the project site or in the vicinity of the project site. New housing would not be provided within the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan Area, and thus additional housing opportunities would not be realized. Impacts to population and housing growth would be less than significant and less than those associated with the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Public Services

Police Protection: This alternative would not involve any new development or housing. As a result, this alternative would not result in a potential decrease for the demand of law enforcement and protection services provided by the Los Angeles Police Department as a result of improvements to the project site (refer to Section IV.J, Public Services). However, given the state of neglect and use as a depository for various items (furniture, trash, etc.), the site can harbor people or activities that could be deemed undesirable and potentially compromise public safety. Therefore, police protection impacts under this alternative would be less than significant, but would be greater than the proposed project's less than significant impacts due to the site's current condition.

Fire Protection: This alternative would not involve any new development or housing. As a result, this alternative would not result in an increase for the demand of fire protection and emergency services provided by the Los Angeles Fire Department. However, under this alternative, the Tower of Wooden Pallets, which has been identified as a fire hazard would remain on site. The Tower is not maintained and is surrounded by other debris and structures in similar states of decay and disrepair, posing a potential fire risk. Therefore, fire protection impacts under this alternative would not be significant but are potentially greater than the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Schools: This alternative would not involve any new development or housing. No new students would be generated, and therefore public schools would not be impacted. Although no new school fees would be generated for the Los Angeles Unified School District, impacts on schools would be less under this alternative as compared to the proposed project's less than significant impact.

Transportation and Traffic

This alternative would not generate any construction traffic as there would not be any new construction or grading activities. Construction impacts under this alternative would not be significant and would be less than the impact of the proposed project. This alternative would not generate any new trips at the project site, as compared to 722 daily trips for the proposed project. This alternative would not generate new trips during the morning and afternoon peak hours, as compared to the proposed project's 52 and 72 trips during those hours, respectively. Therefore, traffic impacts to study intersections under this alternative would not be significant and would be less than the proposed project's less than significant impacts. Under this alternative, freeway conditions would not change, and thus no significant impacts would occur. This alternative's impact on freeways would be less than those associated with the project's less than significant impacts. Parking conditions would not be altered and would result in no significant impacts. Thus, parking impacts would be less than the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Impact Summary

This alternative would leave the project site in its present condition. None of the impacts associated with residential development and construction activities would occur if this alternative were selected. The significant and unavoidable project impacts on historic resources and construction noise would be avoided. However, impacts to aesthetics, operational water quality, police and fire protection would potentially be greater than the proposed project as the project site and existing structures are in advanced states of decay and dereliction and present unfavorable views of the project site as well as possible unmonitored areas for deviant behavior and crimes and fire hazards. In addition, this alternative would not meet the requirements of the City of Los Angeles Housing Element or the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan in providing more affordable housing particularly with 3 or more bedrooms and

improving the quality of the residential environment. Since this alternative avoids the proposed project's significant and unavoidable impacts to historic resources and construction-related noise, this alternative's environmental impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed project.

Relationship to the Project Objectives

Under this alternative, no additional dwelling units would be provided to the housing stock within the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan Area. Affordable housing for disabled persons also would not be provided. Other project goals would not be realized, such as the creation of new market-rate housing close to employment centers and mass transit; creation of a modern residential building that meets current fire, life safety code requirements; and location of additional residents to the area, which would patronize local businesses.

2. ALTERNATIVE 2: REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

This alternative analyzes a Reduced Density Alternative intended to reduce the project's unavoidable and significant impacts on historic resources and construction noise. Under this alternative, the proposed project would be built without the density bonus of 25%, and therefore, without the provision of 5 units set aside as affordable housing for disabled persons, for a total of 78 apartments in one building on-site. It is assumed that the reduced density building would be constructed within the 45-foot building envelope.

Analysis of Environmental Impacts

The potential environmental impacts associated with this alternative are described below and are compared to the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.

Visual Resources

Under this alternative, the project site would be developed in the same way as the proposed project with similar lot coverage and height. The existing on-site structures and the Cultural-Historic Monument would be demolished. Existing views of the project site would change from an overgrown site littered with trash and debris to a landscaped apartment building similar in height and style to the surrounding land uses. Impacts would be very similar to those associated with the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

There are no natural features within the project area. Views of the Santa Monica Mountains are afforded from Sepulveda Boulevard, traveling south and views of the Santa Susana Mountains are visible from Sepulveda Blvd. traveling north. However, along Magnolia Boulevard, the mountains are mostly obstructed by trees and intervening topography and buildings. As with the proposed project,

implementation of this alternative is likely to obstruct views of the Santa Monica Mountains for a limited number of residents in the 4-story condominium building on Weddington Street to the south of the project site. However, this would not be considered a substantial adverse effect as not all of the units have mountain views. Impacts would be similar to the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not create any new sources of glares as it would not include exterior materials that would create glare impacts. Compliance with the Los Angeles Municipal Code's reflective materials design standards (Section 9.04.10.02.070), which limits reflective surface areas and the reflectivity of architectural materials used, would reduce any adverse impact from window glass glare. Impacts would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Air Quality

Construction activities associated with this alternative would be similar in duration and scope to those associated with the proposed project. This alternative's short-term construction activities would be similar to the proposed project's less than significant impacts. Since a smaller number of units would be constructed, fewer traffic emissions would be generated under this alternative. Therefore, long-term air quality impacts under this alternative would be less than significant and less than the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, all existing structures on the project site would be demolished and a 78 unit apartment building would be constructed on the proposed project site. While the Cultural-Historic Monument on the project site is not eligible for listing in the National or California Registers of Historic Place, the Tower of Wooden Pallets was designated a Monument by the City of Los Angeles in 1978. Demolition of the Monument would result in a significant impact under CEQA as there would be a permanent loss of an historic resource. As in the proposed project, implementation of this alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to an historic resource.

Although unlikely, subsurface archaeological and paleontological deposits could potentially exist beneath existing structures, asphalt or landscaped areas. As in the proposed project, in the event that archaeological or paleontological resources are encountered during implementation (e.g., demolition, excavation, etc.) mitigation measures have been provided to mitigate potential impacts. Therefore, impacts from this alternative to archaeological and paleontological resources would be less than significant and very similar to the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Geology and Soils

Under this alternative, grading and construction activities would be very similar to those under the proposed project, it is likely that the 78-unit apartment building would occupy approximately the same building footprint as the proposed project and therefore impacts with regard to soil erosion and sedimentation would be similar to the proposed project's less than significant impacts. The project site would still be subjected to ground shaking and seismic settlement. However, fewer people would be exposed to such seismic hazards under this alternative than under the proposed project. Therefore, shaking and seismic impacts associated with this alternative would be less than significant and similar to those associated with the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

If this alternative is undertaken, demolition and construction activities would be very similar to those for the proposed project. As a result, there would be a potential for short-term exposure to lead-based paint materials and other hazardous materials or substances present in the trash and debris covering the project site. Therefore, hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be similar to the proposed project and site clearance and clean up activities would be subject to the same regulations. This alternative's impact would be less than significant and would be similar to the project's less than significant impact.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative, an apartment building similar in scale, but with 78 units would be built on the project site. New impermeable surfaces (e.g. buildings and driveways) constructed under this alternative would be similar in scale and surface area to those constructed under the proposed project. Like the proposed project, this alternative would not result in any significant impacts related to the amount or rate of stormwater runoff or surface hydrology impacts. Operational water quality impacts associated with this alternative would be similar to the proposed project's less than significant water quality impacts.

Noise

Under this alternative an apartment project of similar scale, but with 78 units would be built on the project site. Like the proposed project, the construction activities would result in intermittent noise levels exceeding the normally acceptable range for sensitive receptors. Impacts would therefore be significant requiring mitigation. With mitigation measures though, impacts still would be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, noise impacts associated with construction and operation of this alternative would be similar to the proposed project's significant impacts.

Population and Housing

This alternative would involve the development of 78 multi-family residential units on the project site. This alternative would not provide five affordable housing units for disabled people. This alternative would provide additional housing stock in the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan Area and would be consistent with the Community Plan, the City of Los Angeles Housing Element and the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide. Therefore, impacts to population and housing growth would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Public Services

Police Protection: Similar to the proposed project this alternative would involve the development of new housing and could result in an increase for the demand of law enforcement and protection services provided by the Los Angeles Police Department. However, according to the LAPD, the clearance and occupancy of the project site would remove an under-utilized area of land and could result in a reduction in crime in that localized area, in addition, the LAPD's Van Nuys Community Police Station serving the project site has sufficient equipment and staff to provide police protection services to the proposed project site. Therefore, police protection impacts under this alternative would not be significant and would be similar to the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Fire Protection: Similar to the proposed project this alternative would involve the development of new housing and could result in an increase for the demand of fire protection and emergency services provided by the Los Angeles Fire Department. However, the nearest fire station is located approximately one mile from the project site and has adequate equipment and staffing levels to accommodate additional demand for fire services generated by development of the project site. Therefore, fire protection impacts under this alternative would not be significant and would be similar to the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Schools: Similar to the proposed project this alternative would involve the development of new housing which could generate new students. However, the schools serving the project site demonstrated that they have sufficient capacity to accommodate the 44 additional students that would be generated by the proposed project according to LAUSD generation rates. This alternative involves the provision of 78 residential units, 20 units less than in the proposed project and therefore, the number of students generated would also be fewer. Therefore, impacts under this alternative to public schools would not be significant. This alternative's school impacts would be less than the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Transportation and Traffic

This alternative would generate a similar amount of construction traffic as the proposed project. Construction impacts under this alternative would not be significant and would be less than the impacts of the proposed project. This alternative involves the provision of 20 fewer dwelling units at the project site and would accordingly generate fewer new trips, as compared to 722 daily trips for the proposed project. This alternative would also generate fewer new trips during the morning and afternoon peak hours, as compared to the proposed project's 52 and 72 trips during those hours, respectively. Therefore, traffic impacts to study intersections under this alternative would not be significant and would be less than the proposed project's less than significant impacts. This alternative's impact on freeways would be less than those associated with the project's less than significant impacts. Parking conditions would be similar to the proposed project's and would result in no significant impacts. Thus, parking impacts would be less than the proposed project's less than significant impacts.

Impact Summary

This alternative would construct a 78-unit apartment building on the project site. If this alternative were selected, the significant and unavoidable project impacts on historic resources and construction noise would still occur. Implementation of this alternative would bring additional population to the area, which would patronize local businesses, although these would be a slightly smaller population as compared to the proposed project. This alternative's environmental impacts would be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

Relationship of Alternatives to Project Objectives

The analysis of this alternative assumes the development of a reduced-density apartment building as well as development of the related projects. As in the proposed project, under this alternative additional dwelling units would be provided to the housing stock within the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan Area, but affordable housing for disabled persons would not be provided.

3. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of a proposed project and the alternatives, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an "environmentally superior" alternative be selected and the reasons for such a selection disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least amount of adverse impacts. In this case, the No Project Alternative would result in the least amount of environmental impacts. However, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an environmentally superior

alternative be selected other than the No Project Alternative. Based on the alternatives analysis provided above and the Alternatives Comparison Table (see Table VI-1), the Reduced Density has been chosen as the environmentally superior alternative since it would result in the least amount of adverse impacts, and whilst it would not avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impacts to historic resources it could slightly reduce construction-related noise impacts though it still would remain significant and unavoidable. This alternative, however, does not meet all of the project objectives listed in Section III.D.(Project Description) and would not take full advantage of allowable density, nor would it provide affordable housing for disabled persons.

Table VI-1
Alternatives Comparison

Impact Area	Alternative 1 No Project Alternative	Alternative 2 Reduced Density Alternative
Visual Resources		
Visual Character	GREATER	SIMILAR
Valued Views	LESS	SIMILAR
Light/Glare	SIMILAR	SIMILAR
Air Quality		
Construction	LESS	SIMILAR
Operation	LESS	LESS
Cultural Resources		
Historic	LESS	SIMILAR
Paleotological/Archaeological	LESS	SIMILAR
Geology and Soils		
Soil Erosion	LESS	SIMILAR
Seismicity	LESS	LESS
Hazards	LESS	SIMILAR
Hydrology		
Surface Runoff	LESS	SIMILAR
Water Quality	GREATER	SIMILAR
Noise		
Short-Term	LESS	SIMILAR
Long-Term	LESS	SIMILAR
Population and Housing		
Growth	LESS	SIMILAR

Table VI-1
Alternatives Comparison

Impact Area	Alternative 1 No Project Alternative	Alternative 2 Reduced Density Alternative
Public Services		
Police Protection	GREATER	SIMILAR
Fire Protection	GREATER	SIMILAR
Schools	LESS	LESS
Traffic		
Construction	LESS	SIMILAR
Freeway	LESS	LESS
Parking	LESS	LESS

LESS: *Impacts of the alternative are less as compared to the proposed project.*
SIMILAR: *Impacts of the alternative are similar as compared to the proposed project.*
GREATER: *Impacts of the alternative are greater as compared to the proposed project.*
Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, April 2004.