
VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

Section 15126(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR, “Describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of a project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” Section 15126 (d) (1) further provides that, “the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.” The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.

The primary objective to provide an evaluation of alternatives is to allow informed decisions for discretionary actions related to the project. Neither the CEQA statutes, the CEQA Guidelines, nor recent court cases specify a precise number of alternatives required to be discussed in an EIR. The CEQA Guidelines do, however, state that a “No Project” alternative must be included, and when appropriate, an alternative site location should be considered. Other project alternatives may involve modifications to the proposed land uses or other project elements at the same project location.

CEQA prohibits public agencies from approving projects as proposed if there are “feasible” alternatives or “feasible” mitigation measures available to the project proponent that substantially lessen the significant adverse environmental effects of such projects. The term “feasible” as used in this analysis means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.¹

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND DEEMED INFEASIBLE

Over the past 24 years, Hillcrest Christian School and Church has expanded its student capacity to the extent that it can no longer accommodate the demand within the existing campus boundaries. While school growth has been a naturally progressing process, plans to expand the existing campus has been a constant consideration for the Hillcrest Christian School Board of Directors

¹ Title 14 C.C.R. (CEQA Guidelines) §15364, and P.R.C §21061.01.

**Table VI-1
Hillcrest Christian School History Of Student Enrollment**

School Year	Total Student Enrollment	Student Increase / (Decrease)	Percentage Increase / (Decrease)
1976-77	27	0	0
1977-78	160	150	555%
1978-79	226	106	66%
1979-80	299	33	12%
1980-81	322	23	8%
1981-82	304	(18)	(6)%
1982-83	262	(42)	(14)%
1983-84	298	36	14%
1984-85	321	23	8%
1985-86	333	12	4%
1986-87	377	44	13%
1987-88	394	17	5%
1988-89	405	11	3%
1989-90	410	5	1%
1990-91	449	39	10%
1991-92	495	46	10%
1992-93	525	30	6%
1993-94	530	10	2%
1994-95	535	5	1%
1995-96	542	7	1%
1996-97	570	28	5%
1997-98	640	70	12%
1998-99	675	35	5%
1999-00	745	70	10%
2000-01	800	55	8%

Source: Hillcrest Christian School, September 5, 2000.

over the past several years. As indicated in Table VI-1, above, Hillcrest's history of student enrollment demonstrates a steadily growing demand for student capacity.

Alternative Locations

Based on their increasing student enrollment trends, the Hillcrest Christian School and Church has been aware of the fact that they need additional space to accommodate future growth. Over the past few years the Hillcrest Christian School and Church Board of Directors has sought opportunities to purchase

other properties to accommodate the enrollment growth of their elementary and secondary school services. As discussed below, Hillcrest Christian School has exhausted virtually all possibilities for finding a suitable site and have initiated several failed negotiations for the acquisition of potential feasible and attractive sites.

Finding alternative locations for relocating the Hillcrest Christian School and Church Campus is primarily guided by the following factors: (1) proximity to the existing site, (2) the size of the site, and (3) the availability and feasibility of acquiring the site. The Hillcrest Christian School and Church has an existing student capacity in which it needs to provide continued service for. It is widely understood that many of the families that have selected to send their children to Hillcrest have done so on the basis of quality education as well as convenience. Many of Hillcrest's currently enrolling families have selected the school for its location, in proximity to their residence. The geographic range for selecting alternative locations is therefore limited to the Granada Hills area with selective consideration of sites in the immediately surrounding areas.

Given this geographic range, an alternative campus site would need to be large enough to accommodate the special needs of the Hillcrest Christian School and Church services. At a minimum, the site would need to be as large as the combined area of the East Campus and proposed West Campus site, which is approximately 9 acres. The site would need to accommodate both campuses because separating the Campuses is infeasible from an operational standpoint. A unified, or joined Campus is essential to the Hillcrest school because it allows the school to serve families with children in both elementary and secondary grade levels from the same local.. The following is a summary of previous attempts to purchase alternative sites which have met some or all of the alternative site criteria. Unfortunately, Hillcrest was unable to secure negotiations for any of these situations.

Shepherd of the Hills Site

Hillcrest Christian School and Church partially operates in partnership with the Shepherd of the Hills Church and utilizes its church facilities located at 19700 Rinaldi Street (at Tampa Avenue). The Shepherd of the Hills Church property is partially vacant and occupies approximately 4 acres. Because of these reasons and the fact that the site is relatively close to the existing Hillcrest Campus (i.e., approximately 2.5 miles west on Rinaldi Street) it seems probable that this site may be suitable for a potential acquisition or merger. However, the Shepherd of the Hills Church site is not owned by the Hillcrest Christian School and the Shepherd of the Hills organization is not interested in dividing or selling any property to the Hillcrest Christian School and Church. The Hillcrest Christian School and Church inquired with the Shepherd of the Hills organization regarding the future use of that site. Shepherd of the Hills indicated that any division of their property would preclude any future plans for their expansion of services. Therefore, they are not interested in selling any of their property to the

Hillcrest Christian School and Church. For these reasons, this alternative site location was dismissed since it is not a potentially feasible site.

Other Potential Sites Considered

In 1993 Hillcrest tried to purchase vacant property in the vicinity of Shoshone Avenue and Mayerling Street. Hillcrest could not negotiate a settlement price with the then property owners. The site has since been subdivided and developed with single-family residential properties. That development is completely developed and has become a part of the expanding residential neighborhood north of the existing Hillcrest Christian School and Church property.

In 1995 the Hillcrest Christian School and Church Board of Directors investigated redeveloping a Coast Federal building complex at the corner of Zelzah Avenue and Chatsworth Street. The asking price for that property again proved infeasible and subsequently the property owner sold to another developer.

Also in 1995, the Hillcrest Christian School and Church Board of Directors began investigating a vacant LAUSD school property on Louise Avenue in the vicinity of California State University of Northridge (CSUN). At that time, that property was not used by LAUSD for reasons associated with bussing and the site was used under agreement with CSUN as a supplemental parking lot for the college. Active and ongoing negotiations and lease agreements between the LAUSD and CSUN preclude that site as a possibility for Hillcrest's expansion.

In 1996 the Hillcrest Christian School and Church Board of Directors began negotiating with the LAUSD to purchase the Adult School site across from the existing East Campus, south side of Rinaldi Street. After Hillcrest incurred great costs, LAUSD broke off negotiations in the final stages of a potential settlement.

Since that time, after repeated failed negotiations, the Hillcrest Christian School and Church acquired the West Campus properties as a site on which to expand their existing Campus. The Hillcrest Christian School and Church has maintained ongoing efforts to locate additional properties within the Granada Hills area and routinely inquire for the availability of large commercial land, suitable for developing a Campus. To date, no such land has become available on the market. For the reasons discussed above, an alternative site is precluded from additional consideration as a potential and feasible project alternative.

VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

A. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that a “No Project” alternative be evaluated along with its environmental impact. The purpose of describing and analyzing a “No Project” alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The baseline conditions for the “No Project” analysis are based on the existing environmental conditions at the time of the Notice of Preparation. The NOP was circulated in June, 2000. In addition to taking no further action on the proposed project, CEQA requires the “No Project” alternative analysis to include assumptions about what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (e)(2)). For purposes of analyzing a No Project Alternative, the future use of the site would be the continued residential use of the three existing residential properties. The following discussion provides a comparative analysis describing impacts that would occur under a No Project alternative as compared to the proposed project for each of the environmental issue areas discussed within Section IV, Environmental Impact Analysis.

Aesthetics

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing aesthetic characteristics would remain unchanged. The existing environment is characterized in the project impact analysis. While the determination of aesthetic impacts is a subjective undertaking, some may characterize the existing condition of the residential properties as dilapidated and unkempt. This characterization is evident by a few of the NOP comment letters submitted in favor of the proposed project. With this Alternative, the proposed landscaping features of the project which will add new trees and greenery in highly visible areas along Shoshone Avenue and Rinaldi Street would not be provided. The site would continue to look vacant from vantage points off of Rinaldi Street. Nevertheless, this alternative would involve no new construction, thus impacts on existing views (obstruction of views) would remain unchanged. While the project’s impacts upon obstruction of views was determined to be less than significant, this alternative would further reduce those impacts.

Air Quality

No new sources of air quality emissions would be generated by this Alternative. No new construction would occur and operational characteristics on the subject property would remain unchanged. Impacts upon air quality would be less than significant and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

The No Project Alternative would involve no new construction on the West Campus property. As such, the existing vegetation and tree cover would remain intact. No new impacts upon biological impacts would occur, thus there would not be any need for any oak tree mitigation. The site would continue, however, to be routinely disked and weeded in compliance with the City of Los Angeles Fire Department regulations. Impacts to biological resources would be less than significant and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Geotechnical Hazards

The No Project Alternative would involve no grading or construction activities on the West Campus site. As such, the existing residential houses would remain intact. This alternative would not increase the on-site population in an area with high seismic risks. While the geotechnical investigation found the West Campus site to be geotechnically feasible from an engineering standpoint, and impacts would be less than significant, this alternative would involve no new grading or construction activities and impacts would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Historical Resources

Under the No Project Alternative, the potentially historic structure located at 17551 Rinaldi Street would remain in place. The existing structure would continue to serve as a single family residence. Under the proposed project, this historic resource will have to be removed from the site. As indicated in the project analysis, the project will result in an unavoidable significant impact on an historic resource if the structure can not be relocated to another site. The No Project Alternative would clearly avoid any potentially significant impacts upon historic resources. Impacts would therefore be less than significant under this alternative and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Hydrology/Water Quality

The No Project Alternative would involve no grading or construction activities on the West Campus site. As such, this Alternative would have no impact on the existing drainage or hydrological conditions on or around the project site. While no significant impacts were identified as a result of the proposed project, this Alternative would further reduce any impacts to the existing drainage or hydrological conditions on the West Campus site.

Land Use

The No Project Alternative would require no entitlement actions as no new construction or uses would be employed on the project site. The existing residential uses on the West Campus site are consistent with the underlying zoning and General Plan designations, thus no land use compatibility impacts would be created. While the proposed project would be consistent with the existing A1-1-K zoning designation and substantially consistent with applicable goals and objectives of the Granada Hills/Knollwood Community Plan, this alternative would further reduce land use impacts as no land use entitlements or discretionary actions would be required.

Noise

No new noise sources would be generated by this Alternative. No new construction would occur and operational characteristics for the East and West Campus properties would remain unchanged. Impacts upon ambient noise conditions would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Operational noise impacts under either scenario would be less than significant.

Public Services

The No Project Alternative would not involve and new construction and would not increase the existing on-site population for either the West or East Campus. As such no new demands upon police or fire services would be created. The West Campus site is located in a designated Mountain Fire District, and has the potential to pose a high fire hazard. As a majority of the site is vacant and inhabited by quick growing invasive weed and grass species, the site is routinely disked and weeded for fire suppression measures. Such activities would continue under this alternative as implementation of brush clearing is mandated by City Ordinance. Impacts to public services would be less than significant and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Traffic and Circulation

Future traffic conditions for the No Project Alternative are reflected in the traffic impact analysis for the future year 2005 without the proposed project. As shown in Table VI.A-1 on page 264, future traffic conditions without implementation of the proposed project will result in LOS values of E or F at six of the twelve study intersections during the a.m. peak hour. Namely, these intersections include: Balboa Boulevard and the westbound 118 Freeway Ramps, Balboa Boulevard and Rinaldi Street,

**Table VI.A-1
Future Traffic Conditions (Year 2005) Without Project**

Intersection	Existing Conditions				Pre-Project Conditions (2005)			
	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
Balboa/EB Ramps	A	0.460	C	0.747	A	0.512	D	0.833
Balboa/WB Ramps	D	0.856	C	0.781	E	0.942	D	0.871
Rinaldi/Balboa	F	1.027	E	0.975	F	1.146	F	1.088
Rinaldi/Louise	E	0.920	A	0.480	F	1.030	A	0.565
Rinaldi/Andasol	B	0.662	A	0.395	C	0.742	A	0.469
Rinaldi/Encino	A	0.542	A	0.504	B	0.613	A	0.588
Rinaldi/Shoshone	E	0.988	A	0.534	F	1.115	B	0.646
Rinaldi/White Oak	B	0.657	A	0.515	C	0.732	B	0.605
Rinaldi/Zelzah	B	0.653	B	0.615	C	0.730	C	0.720
Rinaldi/Reseda	F	1.008	C	0.774	F	1.115	D	0.867
Rinaldi/WB Ramps	B	0.630	D	0.873	C	0.709	F	1.006
Reseda/EB Ramps	D	0.877	C	0.767	E	0.968	D	0.853

^a Level of Service.
^b Volume to Capacity Ratio.
Source: Traffic Impact Analysis, Greer & Co., Engineers and Planners, April 2001.

Rinaldi Street and Louise Avenue, Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue, Rinaldi Street and Reseda Boulevard, and Reseda Boulevard and the eastbound 118 Freeway ramps. Though volume to capacity ratios would be reduced under the No Project Alternative, LOS values for am peak hour traffic would be the same under the No Project Alternative as compared to the proposed project. Future “no project” pm peak hour traffic conditions would result in LOS values of E or F at two of the twelve study intersections, namely at the intersections of Rinaldi Street/Balboa Boulevard and Rinaldi Street and the WB 118 Freeway ramps. The No Project Alternative would result in the same LOS values for all study intersections except for the Rinaldi Street/Encino Street intersection, which would experience a LOS of B with the proposed project as compared to a LOS of A under the No Project Alternative. As such, this alternative would have reduced traffic impacts as compared to the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not result in any changes to the existing parking conditions for the for the existing school operations. No new parking demands would be generated.

Risk of Upset

The No Project Alternative would have slightly increased impacts as the proposed project in terms of potential for risk of upset. Due to their age of construction, the existing structures on the West Campus

have the potential to contain materials with asbestos and lead based paint. Exposure to such materials could pose health hazards to residents if such materials are disturbed by remodeling or construction activities. Because these potentially hazardous materials are generally harmless unless inhaled or digested, regulatory abatement procedures are not required unless the structures are undergoing construction activities that will create airborne particulates and dust. Since these structures would not be subject to any constriction or remodeling activities under this alternative, regulatory compliance and abatement would not be required. Left undisturbed, asbestos and lead based paint would pose a less than significant impact to persons residing in the structures. However disclosure statements are required to inform occupants of the potentially hazardous substances so future disturbance of such materials can be avoided. Impacts associated with risk of upset would be less than significant and the slightly increased as compared to the proposed project.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives/Feasibility

The No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the project's objectives. As a result, Hillcrest Christian School and Church would be precluded from increasing their student enrollment capacity at the present location. Hillcrest School and Church would be forced to either turn away future student enrollment requests or continue to seek alternatives to meet the growing demand for school services. As discussed previously, seeking alternatives to accommodate student growth rates has proven a difficult and nearly impossible task. As such, aside from the alternatives evaluated herein, the No Project Alternative would force the applicant to turn away future enrollment requests. Thus, the demands for school services would be diverted to other public and private schools in the project vicinity.

VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

B. REDUCED BUILDING SIZE ALTERNATIVE

For purposes of analyzing a Reduced Building Size Alternative, a Reduced Building Size Alternative would include an increase to the maximum student enrollment that is identical to the proposed project (i.e., 400 student increase for the West Campus). However, this alternative seeks to reduce impacts associated with aesthetics/views and further reduce the scale and massing of the structure by reducing the overall size of the building. Under this revised design, it is assumed the proposed education facility could be scaled back by approximately 10 percent, or 7,200 square feet, while still accommodating the proposed 400 student enrollment. The redesigned structure would still be tiered with one-, two-, and three-story elevations. However, the third story would occupy less area and would be set back farther from Shoshone Avenue. The revised building would include eight fewer standard sized classrooms, instead of the 16 that are currently proposed, and would include the same number of specialty classrooms. There would be no change in any of the infrastructure work needed on the site as all utilities, sewer lines, street work, grading and site work would be required as under the proposed project.

This Alternative assumes the same general Site Plan as the proposed project, with 124 parking spaces in a surface parking lot with ingress/egress access form Rinaldi Street. The athletic field area would be configured as proposed under the proposed project.

Aesthetics

The Reduced Building Size Alternative would generally reflect the same design characteristics as the proposed project. The building footprint and landscape design would be identical under either scenario. However, this alternative, would include a smaller third story elevation, with the third floor being set back farther from Shoshone Avenue. This design would be comparatively similar to the proposed project, with a reduction in building mass as perceived from the south and east along the roadways. Views from the north and northwest, would essentially remain the same as the structure would still be built at a height of 45 feet from lowest grade, extending 17 feet high above the average grade at Ridgeway Road. As such, impacts upon private views from areas directly north and west of the project site along Ridgeway Road (i.e., Views No. 8 , No. 9 and No. 10) would be comparatively similar to the proposed project. Public views of the site from Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue (looking directly north or south along Shoshone) would be slightly improved as the height of the education building would be lower along the street frontage. Aesthetic impacts would be less than significant under either this scenario or the proposed project, however, impacts would be further reduced under this alternative.

Air Quality

Air quality impacts during construction would be roughly comparable to those generated by the proposed project. Most of the air quality pollutants generated by construction activities are attributed to grading and site preparation activities. Both scenarios would require the same amount of grading as they would have identical building footprints and site plan designs. The air quality impacts associated with each scenario would be similar for PM₁₀ pollutants. Construction emissions associated with worker vehicle trips and structural building would be slightly reduced under this alternative, as it would involve construction of a smaller building. Although this alternative would have slightly reduced construction emissions as compared to the proposed project, both scenarios would have less than significant construction air quality impacts.

Air quality pollutants associated with operation of the project (and this alternative) are primarily based on vehicle trips. Since both alternatives would result in maximum student enrollments of 400 students on the West Campus (1,200 students for both campuses combined), each scenario would generate similar air quality impacts. As such, impacts under either scenario would be less than significant.

Biological Resources

This alternative would have similar impacts upon biological resources as the proposed project. Both scenarios involve developments with a similar building footprint and site plan design and would require grading the entire area. As indicated in the project analysis no federal or state listed species are known to occur of the project site. Both scenarios would require the removal of the same number of trees (and oak trees) as the entire site would have to be graded and redeveloped. The final Landscape Plan proposed for this alternative would be similar to the one proposed for the proposed project. All of the impacts and mitigation measures that apply to the proposed project would apply to this alternative.

Geotechnical Hazards

Impacts associated with geotechnical hazards would be the same under this alternative as they would be for the proposed project. Both scenarios involve developing a structure within the same building footprint. Both scenarios involve projects that would increase the on-site population within an area with demonstrated seismic risks. These risks, however, are not considered to be substantially higher at this location than those present throughout the southern California Region. As determined in the project analysis, the fault traces investigated on the West Campus site were concluded to be inactive, as no evidence of active movement (i.e., geological movement within the past 11,000 years) was identified in the fault hazard trenching investigation. As such, no structural setbacks are required. The Alternative building structure will be built in conformance with all of the recommendations and mitigation measures

that apply to the proposed project. Geotechnical impacts as a result of this alternative and the proposed project would be comparatively equal and less than significant.

Historical Resources

Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in removal of a structure that has been determined to be eligible for listing as an historic resource. As such, both this Alternative and the proposed project would result in similar potentially significant impacts associated with the loss of an historic structure. This Alternative would thus require the same mitigation (i.e., relocation of the structure to another locale in the general vicinity of the project site) to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Since this Alternative would involve a building footprint and site plan design that is identical to the proposed project, both scenarios would have similar impacts upon hydrology and drainage impacts. Impacts associated with water quality would be the same as the project would include the same number of vehicles entering and exiting the parking lot. Thus impacts associated with soil and grease deposition would be similar. Under either scenario, however, the applicant will be required to incorporate appropriate SUSMP requirements into their project plans to reduce potential impact upon surface water quality. Impact would be similar and less than significant under either scenario.

Land Use

In terms of land use compatibility, this alternative would be similar to the proposed project. Both scenarios involve developing the same school use on the same A1-1 zoned site. As stated for the project impact analysis, a conditional use approval would be required as part of the entitlement process.

In terms of consistency with applicable regional plans, both the project and Alternative would have similar impacts associated with the allowable use and general project characteristics. Though no significant impacts were identified for the proposed building design, this alternative would be generally more compatible with the surrounding residential area than a larger building. Although impacts would be less than significant under either scenario, impacts associated with scale and massing would be further reduced under this Alternative design.

Noise

Construction noise impacts under this Reduced Building Size Alternative would be the same as they would under the proposed project. Noise associated with the construction process would be similar

during the grading and site preparation stages, but would be slightly reduced and shortened during the actual building construction period.

Operational impacts associated with vehicular noise sources would be less than significant and the same under either scenario. This is because both the project and Alternative project scenario include the same student enrollment for both campuses and both scenarios include a similar site plan design. Overall, noise impacts under this alternative would be slightly reduced as compared to the proposed project. However, both scenarios would result in less than significant impacts.

Public Services

This alternative involves a project with the same number of students as the proposed project. As such, the associated demand upon public services (police, fire, and medical emergencies) would be the same under either scenario. Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would have less than significant impacts upon public services.

Traffic and Circulation

The Reduced Building Size Alternative would include a project with a maximum student enrollment that is identical to the proposed project. Both scenarios would include an enrollment increase of 400 students and would be developed with the same number of parking stalls with the exact same site plan design. As such, the average daily trips associated with the proposed project and resulting impacts on adjacent roadways would be the same under this Alternative. Impacts associated with traffic conditions on adjacent roadways, access, and parking availability would be similar under either scenario. With implementation of the traffic mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project, all traffic and parking impacts would be reduced to levels of less than significance.

Risk of Upset

The Reduced Building Size Alternative would have similar less than significant impacts as the proposed project. Both scenarios would involve demolition of structures that have the potential to contain asbestos and lead based paint. Exposure to such materials could pose health hazards to construction workers and individuals in the immediate project vicinity. However, hazards associated with these impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels with proper regulatory abatement procedures. As with the proposed project, this alternative would require removal and abatement of suspect asbestos containing materials and lead based paint in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. Impacts associated with risk of upset would be less than significant and the same as the proposed project.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives/Feasibility

This alternative would generally obtain the project objectives, though to a lesser extent than the project. The redesign of the proposed education building would reduce the performance ability of school operations as it would include the same number of students as the project in a slightly smaller education facility. As a result classroom sizes would be increased (in terms of student/teacher ratios) because there would be fewer classrooms to support the 400 student population. In addition, the larger specialty classrooms afforded by the proposed project design would be eliminated under this alternative. Such alterations to the proposed building design would likely have a negative impact on the school's marketability, and could reduce future demands and associated revenues.

Based on information provided by the project applicant's general contractor, it is estimated that the elimination of classroom space would result in a construction cost savings of approximately \$75.00 per square foot.² It should be noted that the reduction of classroom space is not reflective of the total average square foot cost as classrooms are the least expensive areas of the building to construct. This is because classroom spaces do not include bathrooms, plumbing fixtures, or kitchen areas, which involve higher cost per square foot. Building areas for the gymnasium, specialty classrooms/laboratories, and the library, which involve higher costs per square foot, would still be required under this alternative design. There would also be no change in any of the infrastructure work needed on the site because all utilities, sewer lines, street work, grading and site work would essentially remain the same. Thus reducing classroom space would not affect the cost associated with these improvements. Based on a cost savings of \$75/per square foot, a reduction of 7,200 square feet of classroom area would reduce the costs of developing the site by approximately \$540,000. Based on information provided by the applicants general contractor, this would represent a 4.5% reduction of the total cost of the proposed project.

² *Written correspondence to Rick Donnelly, Hillcrest Christian School, from Mr. Gary B. Blackwell, President, Blackwell Construction Inc., dated May 2, 2001.*

VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

C. RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

The Residential Development Alternative includes redeveloping the West Campus site with five single family residential lots and redeveloping four of the lots with modern residential structures (Figure VI-1 on page 272). The fifth lot would retain the potentially significant structure located at 17551 Rinaldi Street. This development scenario reflects an alternative that best suits the underlying land use and zoning designation for the West Campus site, while at the same time maximizes the development potential of the property.³ As reflected in the General Plan, development on property to the west of Shoshone is limited to a minimum lot size of 1 acre. As the West Campus site is approximately 5.5 acres, a maximum residential development density of 5 subdivided residential parcels can be realized. The project Applicant, the Hillcrest Christian School and Church, is an organization that is committed to providing quality private school services for children in grades K-high school. The Hillcrest Christian School and Church is not in the real estate or residential development business. As such, it is implied that this scenario results from the sale of the West Campus property to private interests which in turn seek to maximize the development potential of the site.

Aesthetics

Upon completion, the Residential Development Alternative would generally reflect the same aesthetic characteristics as the surrounding residential neighborhoods in the immediately surrounding area. The existing residential structures and partially vacant lot would be removed and redeveloped with 5 single family residential houses. Construction of this alternative would require site grading and clearing of all vegetation within the residential building footprint areas, specifically along the frontages of Shoshone Avenue and Rinaldi Street. The trees to the north of the site along the slopes would likely remain as no development would occur in that area. The homes would likely be two story structures and would have the landscaping characteristics as typical residential homes. The existing East Campus will continue to operate and would be located directly across the street from the alternative residential development. Landscaping features along Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue would not be as extensive as compared to the proposed project as each homeowner will be responsible for the care and upkeep of their respective yards. Overall aesthetic impacts would be less than significant and comparable to the proposed project.

³ *School and residential uses have been identified as the only “feasible” uses that can be permitted in the AI Agricultural zone without a zone variance.*

Figure VI-1 Residential Development Alternative

Air Quality

Air quality impacts during construction would be reduced as compared to that generated by the proposed project. The site would involve less grading and site preparation activities as no grading within the hillside areas would be necessary. Construction emissions associated with worker vehicle trips and structural building would also be reduced under this alternative, as it would involve less structural construction. This alternative would result in less than significant construction air quality impacts and would be reduced as compared the proposed project.

Air quality pollutants associated with operation of this alternative would be greatly reduced as compared to the proposed project. Assuming a conservative factor of 9.5 trips per day per residential unit, this alternative would generate approximately 47.5 vehicle trips per day.⁴ As such, this alternative would generate less vehicular emissions than a school use. Air quality impacts under this Alternative would be reduced as compared to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

Biological Resources

Similar to the proposed project, development of this alternative would not impact any known federally or state listed endangered, threatened or species of concern. This alternative would result in the loss or removal of a number of tree species including the remaining two oak trees on site. The requirements for mitigating oak trees would be the same as prescribed for the proposed project. In all, 22 48-inch box replacement oak trees would be required to be planted through out each of these parcels. It is undetermined as to how many mature trees would be impacted (lost) by this development, though it is speculated that a greater number of trees would be retained in place under this scenario. While, a majority of the existing trees are in close proximity to the existing residences, only those trees within the hillside areas would remain in tact. With implementation of the proposed oak tree mitigation, impacts upon biological resources would be comparatively similar to the proposed project.

Geotechnical Hazards

Impacts associated with geotechnical hazards would be the same under this alternative as they would be for the proposed project. Both scenarios involve developing habitable structures on the West Campus site. Both scenarios involve projects that would increase the on-site population within an area with demonstrated seismic risks. Though this alternative would attract fewer individuals overall, the on site

⁴ *Standard trip rates based on Trip Generation, Sixth Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington D.C., 1997; as applied to similar related projects identified in the Hillcrest Christian School Proposed Expansion, Traffic Impact Analysis, Greer and Co., Engineers and Planners, 2000.*

population would reside on site 24 hours a day. These risks, however, would not be substantially higher at this location than any other location throughout the southern California region. As determined in the project analysis, the fault traces investigated on the West Campus property were concluded to be inactive, as no evidence of active movement (i.e., geological movement within the past 11,000 years) was identified in the fault hazard trenching investigation. As such, no structural setbacks are required. Geotechnical impacts as a result of this alternative and the proposed project would be comparatively equal and less than significant.

Historical Resources

Redevelopment of the west campus site as a residential use would require subdividing the existing three lots into 5 parcels of at least one acre in size. This alternative could potentially be developed without demolishing the historic structure at 17551 Rinaldi Street. While the structural integrity of this resource would be retained, the association of the resource to the Sunshine Ranch would be lost, as the site would be reduced in size and surrounded by residential development. Nevertheless, since this alternative could avoid demolition of a potentially eligible historic structure, impacts upon historical resources would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Hydrology/Water Quality

The Residential Development Alternative would involve grading in a smaller area and would not involve any cuts into the hillside areas. As such, stormwater runoff from the hillside would continue to drain southeast ward as it currently does across the project site. Beyond landscaping the front, side and rear yards of the proposed residential parcels, no substantial modifications or stormdrain improvements would be necessary. Impacts upon hydrology and drainage could be accommodated with proper site plan design under either scenario. In addition, single-family residential developments are required to conform to the City's standard stormwater mitigation measures. Similar to the proposed project, impacts associated with hydrology and drainage would be less than significant.

Land Use

Considering the underlying zoning and land use designations, a residential development would be more consistent with the Planning and Zoning Code and General Plan (i.e., Granada Hills/Knollwood Community Plan). Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would require a discretionary action from the City of Los Angeles Planning Commission. This alternative would necessitate a Tentative Tract Map approval to subdivide the existing 3 parcels into 5 separate parcels. Overall, land use impacts would be slightly reduced as compared to the proposed project. However, both scenarios would be compatible with the A1-1-K zoning designation and applicable General Plan objectives/policies.

Noise

Noise impacts under this Residential Development Alternative would be reduced as compared to the proposed project because less overall construction would be required. This alternative would require less grading and site preparation activities as no grading on the hillside areas would be required. In addition, less overall construction would be required because the total square footage of 5 residential houses would be substantially lower than the 75,000 square foot structure proposed for the school expansion. Thus, the duration of the construction period would be reduced considerably. Noise impacts associated with the construction process would be similar in terms of decibel levels, but would be reduced in terms of length of exposure.

Operational impacts associated with vehicular noise sources would be less than significant and also reduced as compared to the proposed project. As mentioned previously, this Alternative would generate fewer vehicle trips than a school expansion project. As such, the noise levels associated with additional motor vehicles would be greatly reduced. Both scenarios would result in less than significant impacts, but impacts would be further reduced under this Alternative.

Public Services

As compared to a school expansion, this Alternative would generate less demands upon police and fire services. Similar to the proposed project access will remain available to the northern areas of the subject property and adjacent hillsides via Ridgeway Road. As mentioned in the project analysis, the subject property is in a designated Mountain Fire District and has a high fire hazard. As such the residents who eventually reside in these homes will need to comply with all applicable Code and regulations associated with brush clearing requirements. Overall, impacts upon public services would be less than significant and slightly reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Traffic and Circulation

The Residential Development Alternative would include a project that generates substantially less traffic than the proposed project. Assuming a conservative factor of 9.5 trips per day per residential unit, this alternative would generate approximately 47.5 vehicle trips per day.⁵ As compared to the 1,400 additional daily trips anticipated to be generated by the proposed school expansion, this alternative would have fewer traffic impacts. It is anticipated that due to the negligible increase in trips that would

⁵ *Standard trip rates based on Trip Generation, Sixth Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington D.C., 1997; as applied to similar related projects identified in the Hillcrest Christian School Proposed Expansion, Traffic Impact Analysis, Greer and Co., Engineers and Planners, 2000.*

be generated by this alternative, impact would be similar to , and slightly worsened (if at all) as compared to the traffic conditions projected for the 2005 buildout year without the proposed project (See related discussion under the No Project Alternative). However, it should be noted that as a result of its incremental increase in traffic generation, this alternative would likely not be required to implement any of the traffic mitigation measures that are proposed under the project. While less than significant traffic impacts would be expected from both the proposed project (with mitigation) and this alternative, traffic impacts would be reduced under this alternative as far less vehicle trips would be generated.

Parking for the proposed residential development would be provided on-site on driveway easements and in attached or detached garage structures. Impacts upon parking availability would thus be less than significant and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Risk of Upset

The Residential Development Alternative would have similar less than significant impacts as the proposed project. Both scenarios would involve demolition of structures that, due to their age of construction, have the potential to contain asbestos and lead based paint. Exposure to such materials could pose health hazards to construction workers and individuals in the immediate project vicinity. However, hazards associated with these impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels with proper regulatory abatement procedures. As with the proposed project, this alternative would require removal and abatement of suspect asbestos containing materials and lead based paint in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. Impacts associated with risk of upset would be less than significant and the same as the proposed project.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives/Feasibility

This alternative would not meet any of the applicants objectives. This project alternative is somewhat reflective of a No Project Alternative as it does nothing to promote or enhance the services provided by the Hillcrest Christian School and Church. The alternative would be sought as a means to recover financial losses associated with property acquisition and design and entitlement fees. Similar to the No Project Alternative, the applicant would be forced to turn away future enrollment requests. Thus, the demands for school services would be diverted to other public and private schools in the project vicinity.

VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

D. REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Density Alternative consists of a West Campus Expansion Plan with a student increase of 200 students as opposed to the 400 student increase proposed under the currently proposed project. Under this scenario, the maximum student enrollment between the East and West Campuses combined would not exceed 1,000 students. The reduction in student capacity would allow for a redesigned and smaller education building. Under this scenario, it is estimated that the entire third floor of the proposed education facility would be eliminated. As a result the total size of the proposed education building would be reduced by approximately 22,000 square feet, or roughly 30 percent. Support rooms such as laboratories, the library, and administration spaces would be essentially unchanged. The redesigned education facility would include an approximately 53,000 square foot education facility with 8 standard sized classrooms and 3 specialty classrooms. Other areas will include administration offices, a gymnasium, and other school-related ancillary uses (i.e., lockers, janitor closets, etc.), similar to what is proposed under the project design. The redesigned structure would be two-stories with the second story stepped back from Rinaldi Street, similar to the proposed project design. The overall height of the building would be reduced to 32 feet, as measured from the building's foundation.

This Reduced Density Alternative assumes the same general Site Plan and building footprint as the proposed project, with 124 parking spaces in a surface parking lot with ingress/egress access from Rinaldi Street. There would be no change in any of the infrastructure work needed on the site as all utilities, sewer lines, street work, grading and site work would be required as under the proposed project. The athletic field area would be configured as proposed under the proposed project.

Aesthetics

The Reduced Density Alternative would generally reflect the same aesthetic characteristics as the proposed project. The building footprint and landscape design would be identical under either scenario. This alternative, however, would include a reduced building height, with the elimination of the entire third floor elevation. This design would reduce view obstructions from areas to the west and north (i.e., Views 8, 9, and 10). These views would essentially remain unobstructed as the redesigned structure would extend approximately 4 feet above the existing grade of Ridgeway Road. The building would also only extend 17 feet above the surface elevation of the proposed playing field. Additionally, public views of the site from Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue would be slightly improved as the height of the education building would be lower. Aesthetic impacts would be less than significant under either scenario, but would be reduced under this alternative.

Air Quality

Air Quality impacts during construction would be only slightly reduced as compared to the proposed project. Most of the air quality pollutants generated by construction activities are attributed to grading and site preparation activities. Both scenarios would require the same amount of grading as they would have identical building footprints and site plan designs. Air quality impacts would thus have similar impacts with regard to PM₁₀ emissions. Construction emissions associated with worker vehicle trips and structural building would be slightly reduced under this alternative, as it would involve construction of a smaller building involving fewer work trips. Although this alternative would have slightly reduced construction emissions as compared to the proposed project, both scenarios would result in less than significant construction air quality impacts.

Operational air quality pollutants are primarily based on vehicle trips. Only minor amounts of air emissions can be attributed to energy demands of facility maintenance and control (i.e., HVAC systems, electrical and natural gas consumption). Because the Reduced Density Alternative would essentially reduce the projects traffic demands by half, a reduction of approximately 700 vehicle trips per day would occur. As such, the air emissions associated with school-related vehicular traffic would correspondingly be reduced by half. Air quality impacts under this alternative would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Both scenarios would result in less than significant air quality impacts and impacts would be further reduced under this alternative.

Biological Resources

This alternative would have identical impacts upon biological resources as the proposed project. Both scenarios involve a structure with a similar building footprint and site plan design and both projects would require grading the entire project site. As indicated in the project analysis, no federal or state listed species are known to occur of the project site. Both scenarios would require the removal of the same number of trees (and oak trees) as the entire site would have to be graded and redeveloped. The final Landscape Plan proposed for this alternative would remain unchanged as compared to the proposed project. All of the impacts and mitigation measures that apply to the proposed project would apply to this alternative.

Geotechnical Hazards

Impacts associated with geotechnical hazards would be the same under this alternative as they would be for the proposed project. As stated above, this alternative would require the same amount of earthwork and excavation as the project, as both scenarios would utilize the same building footprint and site design.

Both scenarios would increase the on-site population within an area with demonstrated seismic risks. The risks from this alternative, however, would be reduced because the population increase associated with this alternative would be cut in half. These risks, however, are not considered to be substantially higher at this location than those present throughout the southern California Region. As determined in the project analysis, the fault traces investigated on the West Campus site were concluded to be inactive, as no evidence of active movement (i.e., geological movement within the past 11,000 years) was identified in the fault hazard trenching investigation.⁶ As such, no structural setbacks are required. Similar to the proposed project the Alternative building structure will be built in conformance with all of the recommendations and mitigation measures that apply to the proposed project. Geotechnical impacts as a result of this alternative and the proposed project would be comparatively equal and less than significant.

Historical Resources

Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would require the demolition or relocation of a structure that has been determined to be eligible for listing as an historic resource. As such, both this Alternative and the proposed project would result in potentially significant yet mitigable impacts associated with the loss of an historic structure. Impacts for this Alternative would be as described for the proposed project. Without relocation a significant and unavoidable historic impact will occur. If, however, the structure can be successfully relocated to another site, the impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Hydrology/Water Quality

This Alternative would involve a building footprint and site plan design that is identical to the proposed project. As such, both scenarios would have similar impacts upon hydrology and drainage impacts. The project includes an identical mix of grass play area, planter areas, paved parking lots, paved driveways and buildings with hardscape areas, water runoff will increase as a result of the proposed project. The West Campus project site will include a drainage system with pipes that vary in size from 12" reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) up to 30" RCP that will adequately convey surface water runoff into the existing 69-inch storm drain that is currently within Shoshone Avenue. Excess runoff from upslope of the project site will be directed towards the grass play area and continued down to Shoshone Avenue. Therefore, the project will not exceed capacity of the existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial amounts of polluted runoff.

⁶ *GeoSystems, Inc. 2000.*

Activities associated with operation of the Alternative would generate substances that could degrade the quality of water runoff. The deposition of certain chemicals by cars on parking lot surfaces could have the potential to contribute metals, oil and grease, solvents, phosphates, hydrocarbons, and suspended solids to the storm drain system. However, impacts to water quality would be reduced since the project must comply with water quality standards and wastewater discharge BMPs set forth by the City of Los Angeles, and the SWRCB. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce the potential for water quality impacts to a less than significant level. Although impacts would be less than significant under either scenario, they would be further reduced under this alternative, as fewer vehicles would be generated to the project site.

Land Use

In terms of land use compatibility, this alternative would have similar land use impacts as the proposed project. Both scenarios involve developing the same school use on the same A1-1 site. As such, the permitting and approval process would be the same under either scenario. In terms of consistency with applicable regional plans, both the project and Alternative would have similar impacts associated with the allowable use and general project characteristics. Impacts associated with scale and massing and structural compatibility would be reduced under this alternative, however, as a result of the reduced building height. The building height of the redesigned alternative structure would be approximately 32 feet, as opposed to 45 feet that is currently proposed. Although impacts would be less than significant under either scenario, impacts associated with scale and massing would be reduced under this Reduced Density Alternative design.

Noise

Construction noise impacts under the Reduced Density Alternative would be generally the same as they would under the proposed project. Noise associated with the construction process would be similar during the grading and site preparation stages, but would be slightly reduced and shortened during the actual building construction period. This would be primarily due to the fact that the alternative would entail the same amount of foundation and earthwork, which generates higher noise levels than finishing construction.

Operational impacts associated with vehicular noise sources would be reduced under this alternative scenario. Vehicular noise impacts would be reduced as fewer cars would be generated by this alternative. This alternative would generate 700 vehicle trips per day as opposed to the 1,400 additional daily trips anticipated by the proposed project. Noise associated with student activity on the campus would also be reduced as the alternative would result in half of the student population as compared to the proposed project. While the corresponding reduction in noise would not be equally reduced by half, noise would be reduced to some extent. However, since no significant noise impacts

were identified for the proposed project, both scenarios would result in less than significant noise impacts.

Public Services

This alternative involves a project that involves 200 fewer students than the proposed project. Though it is acknowledged that this alternative would involve a campus with a lower student population and a reduced on-site population, the general demand associated with a new secondary campus. However, impacts would be substantially similar to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, this Alternative would have less than significant impacts upon public services.

Traffic and Circulation

The Reduced Density Alternative would include a project with a maximum student enrollment that is 200 students less than the proposed project. As compared to the 400 student increase proposed under the project, the average daily trips associated with this scenario and resulting impacts on adjacent roadways would be reduced by approximately 50%. The Reduced Density Alternative would generate an increase of 700 daily trips with 184 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 84 trips during the p.m. peak hour. Impacts associated with traffic conditions on adjacent roadways, access, and parking availability would be slightly less under this scenario. With implementation of the traffic mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project, all traffic and parking impacts could be reduced to levels of less than significance.

This alternative would provide the same number of parking spaces as the proposed project, but would create less of a demand to utilize the parking needs. While the parking conditions under the proposed project are anticipated to be adequate and less than significant, this alternative would result in a greater availability of parking on site. Parking availability impacts would be less than significant under either scenario, but reduced under this alternative.

Risk of Upset

The Reduced Density Alternative would have similar less than significant impacts as the proposed project. Both scenarios would involve demolition of structures that have the potential to contain asbestos and lead based paint. Exposure to such materials could pose health hazards to construction workers and individuals in the immediate project vicinity. However, hazards associated with these impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels with proper regulatory abatement procedures. As with the proposed project, this alternative would require removal and abatement of suspect asbestos

containing materials and lead based paint in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. Impacts associated with risk of upset would be less than significant and the same as the proposed project.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives/Feasibility

The Reduced Density Alternative does not meet the objectives of the proposed project for several reasons. The existing East Campus is currently operating at full capacity with a student enrollment of 800 students. While originally planned and designed to operate as an elementary school, the existing East Campus operations support one-half elementary students and one-half secondary students. As compared to elementary students, secondary students require more specialized facilities and space per student. As such, only 200 of the 400 secondary students would be accommodated by the West Campus Expansion under this alternative scenario which would require many students to remain at the elementary site. Because schools provide improved learning environments when elementary students and secondary students are located on separate campuses, this reduced project size is not a preferable solution.

The elimination of the third floor would result in the elimination of 22,000 square feet of classroom space and approximately 10 bathroom stalls. As previously indicated, the applicant's general contractor estimated that the elimination of classroom space would result in a construction cost savings of approximately \$75.00 per square foot. Although this alternative would reduce the number of bathroom fixtures (approximately 10 stalls would be eliminated) that are located on the third floor, the cost savings associated with this reduction would be relatively small since the major plumbing infrastructure would still need to be installed for the first and second floors. Additionally, there would be no change in any of the infrastructure work needed on the site as all utilities, sewer lines, street work, grading and site work would essentially remain the same. Thus, eliminating the third floor of the proposed education building would not affect the cost associated with these improvements. Therefore, based on a cost savings of \$75/per square foot, a reduction of 22,000 square feet of classroom area would reduce the costs of developing the site by approximately \$1,650,000. This represents an approximate 14% reduction in the total cost of the proposed project. Under this scenario, the applicant's total revenue would be reduced by 50%, which is directly proportionate to the reduction in student enrollment. Based on a cost savings of 14%, a 50% loss of revenue would make this alternative infeasible from a development standpoint.

VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

E. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In addition to the discussion of and comparison of environmental impacts of a proposed project and the alternatives, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA guidelines requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be identified. The evaluation leading to the selection of the environmentally superior alternative involves consideration of the extent that the alternatives reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project, while not increasing the severity of the other environmental impacts analyzed in the EIR. Of the four Alternatives analyzed in the EIR, the No Project Alternative would avoid the unavoidable significant impacts that would occur with development of the proposed project. On that basis, the No Project Alternative would be identified as the environmentally superior alternative. However, as provided by Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, “if the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘no project’ alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” A summary matrix comparison of impacts resulting from each of the alternatives relative to impacts identified for the proposed project is provided in Table VI.E-1 on page 285. As depicted in Table VI.E-1, the Residential Development Alternative is the only project alternative that would substantially reduce the potentially significant impacts identified for the proposed project as compared to all of the other alternatives.

As compared to the proposed project, the Residential Development Alternative would reduce project impacts in all of the environmental issue areas, and would avoid a potentially significant impact upon an historic resource. Preservation in place is the preferred alternative with regard to avoiding or reducing impacts upon an historic resource. While the proposed project and the other school-related alternatives provide for relocation as a means for reducing project impacts to a less than significant level, successful implementation of that mitigation measure can not be guaranteed at this time. The Residential Development Alternative would clearly avoid a potentially significant impact upon an historic resource.

This alternative does not meet any of the objectives of the proposed project. The Applicant operates a private school and church and is not in the real estate development market. The purpose of the West Campus expansion is to improve Hillcrest’s existing operations by separating the elementary students from the secondary students and increasing the total enrollment capacity to accommodate a growing demand for private school services. As this alternative would not meet any of the stated objectives listed in Section III, Project Description, the Applicant will still need to locate an alternative site to accommodate its students. As discussed previously under the Alternative Site Alternative discussion, presented previously, finding a suitable location with a land owner willing to sell the property has proven difficult. Nevertheless, should the Residential Development Alternative be implemented, it is

likely expected to generate secondary environmental impacts at an alternative site, as the Hillcrest Christian School and Church would eventually need to find a larger school site to accommodate its students.

**Table VI.E.-1
PROJECT IMPACTS AND ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS MATRIX**

Environmental Issues	Proposed Project Without Mitigation	Proposed Project With Mitigation	No Project Alternative	Reduced Building Size Alternative	Residential Development Alternative	Reduced Density Alternative
A. Aesthetics	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (=)	LS (-)
B. Air Quality	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (=)	LS (-)	LS (-)
C. Biological Resources	S	LS	LS (-)	LS (=)	LS (-)	LS (=)
D. Geotechnical Hazards	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
E. Historic Resources	S	LS	LS (-)	LS (=)	LS (-)	LS (=)
F. Hydrology/Water Quality	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
G. Land Use	LS	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)
H. Noise	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)
I.1 Police Protection	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (=)	LS (-)	LS (=)
I.2 Fire Protection	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (=)	LS (-)	LS (=)
J.1 Transportation/Circulation	S	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (-)	LS (-)
J.2 Parking	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (=)	LS (-)	LS (-)
K. Risk of Upset	LS	LS (-)	LS (+)	LS (=)	LS (-)	LS (=)

Notes:

The alternatives evaluation assumes net impacts following implementation of applicable mitigation measures, as stated in the analysis.

LS = Less than Significant Impact.

S = Significant Impact.

SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact.

(+) = Impacts would be increased as compared to the proposed project.

(-) = Impacts would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

(+/-) = Impacts would be mixed. While some of the project's negative impacts would be reduced, potential negative impacts would be created or net beneficial impacts would be compromised.

