6.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

A. SUMMARY

Five alternatives to the Main Campus Master Plan were considered, and three were evaluated in detail, based on the potential to reduce identified significant impacts of the project. Based on a comparison of impacts, the Near-Term Development Only Alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives to the project.

B. PURPOSE

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines (“Consideration and Discussion of Alternatives to the Proposed Project”) states: “An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, or to the location of the 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 15126.6(b) states, “Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), 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 those alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.” CEQA also states that “the EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project.” Generally, significant effects of an alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the proposed project, and should provide decision-makers perspective as well as a reasoned choice. However, the Guidelines state that the selection of alternatives should be governed by a “rule of reason.”

C. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Alternatives considered in the EIR should be feasible, and should attain most of the basic project objectives. The primary objectives of the project include:

- Provide for the long-term development of the campuses of City College through the year 2015;
- Provide sufficient facilities, including classrooms, faculty offices, and support space to meet the enrollment projections for the City College campuses;
• Accommodate the projected increase in City College student enrollment at the Ocean Avenue, Chinatown/North Beach and Mission campuses;

• Provide safe, aesthetically appealing, up-to-date space and facilities for City College’s educational programs; and

• Increase connections and interaction between City College campuses and the community.

Other objectives can be found throughout the Master Plan document, as well as in the City College of San Francisco Strategic plan 2003-2008, adopted in February 2003.

D. RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

To consider potential alternatives to the project, the EIR preparers reviewed the significant impacts in Chapter 4.0 of this EIR, identified those impacts that could be substantially avoided or reduced through an alternative, and determined the modifications that would be needed to the Master Plan. The following factors influenced the consideration of project alternatives:

• In general, potential significant impacts related to construction air pollutant emissions, construction noise and construction-related erosion would be adequately mitigated or substantially reduced through standard construction controls. Potential significant impacts related to geotechnical hazards, site contamination and cultural resources would also be adequately mitigated through compliance with existing regulations and guidelines and standard professional practice.

• The increased student enrollment accommodated by the Master Plan would generate traffic that would emit significant quantities of regional air pollutants and could degrade the character of the adjacent neighborhood. The mitigation identified in Sections 4.1 and Section 4.5 would require the College to implement feasible transportation demand management measures to reduce vehicle trips. These impacts could be reduced otherwise only by placing a cap on enrollment growth, a strategy counter to the objectives of the Master Plan and mission of CCSF.

• There are potential impacts to scenic resources related to proposed tree removal. The proposed Master Plan already takes advantage of potential building sites where trees are not present (e.g., the reservoir, the site of the North and South Gymnasiums, the sites of the existing Child Care Center and bungalows.

• There are potential impacts to visual character from the proposed development west of Phelan Avenue. These impacts could be reduced through specific building designs, but the impacts might be
inherent to the generally larger sizes of college buildings. The building sizes are based in part on
the estimated program space required to serve the projected student population.

• There are potential impacts related to congestion at several study intersections. These impacts
would be mitigated through changes to the intersection operations, but the mitigation is under the
jurisdiction of other agencies. As noted earlier, the mitigation identified in Section 4.3 would
require the College to implement feasible TDM measures to reduce vehicle trips. These impacts
could be reduced otherwise only by placing a cap on enrollment growth, a strategy counter to the
objectives of the Master Plan and mission of CCSF.

• There are potential impacts related to increased traffic on Havelock Street, which could be used as
to access the proposed eastern parking garage. The Mitigation identified in Section 4.3 would
require the College to design the garage in such a way as to discourage access from Havelock. The
TDM measures already mentioned would also help to minimize increases in traffic on this roadway.

• The Master Plan team considered several alternative designs when developing the Main Campus
Master Plan, and recommended the proposed project as providing the best scenario from a technical
and environmental standpoint.

E. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED AS INFEASIBLE

Construction at an Alternative Location
Construction of the proposed facilities at an alternative location was not included as a project
alternative because of the likely infeasibility of such an alternative, and the lack of evidence that
such an alternative would avoid or substantially reduce the significant impacts of the proposed project
(in particular, those impacts related to increased traffic). Even if constructing the new facilities on
another site were feasible from an educational standpoint, establishment of a new campus of that size
would take many years to obtain funding, find a feasible site, and prepare and implement campus plans.
This timeline would not meet the objectives of the College with respect to the Main Campus.

Shifting of Growth to Other Campuses
Construction of facilities in such a way as to “shift” projected enrollment to other CCSF campuses was
rejected as an alternative because of its likely infeasibility and its inability to meet College objectives.
The Master Plan already reflects the goal of shifting some of the projected growth in student enrollment
to other campuses in the CCSF system. None of these campuses has the room to serve as a substitute for
the Main Campus:
• The Administration/Adult Learning building houses College administrative and support facilities. This site does have the potential for redevelopment at a higher density. However, an agreement between the College and the San Francisco Unified School District calls for shared use of new space on the site, thus limiting the potential for the site to accommodate substantial numbers of College students. In addition, redevelopment of the site would require site studies, design, and environmental review, and thus would not serve the College’s near-term need for replacement of aging facilities.

• The Airport Campus provides special programs in aeronautics. The site is at San Francisco International Airport and thus would not be able to serve the needs of the general CCSF student population.

• The Alemany Campus offers programs at five locations in the Tenderloin, Sunset District, and Richmond District. Over 95 percent of the classes at the Alemany Campus are English-as-a-Second-Language classes. The Alemany campus has served as many as 4,100 students. Although the transfer of other programs to the Alemany Campus is being considered, the campus would not be able to accommodate the additional 13,500 students projected for the Main Campus.

• The Evans Campus provides training in skilled trades to about 2,000 students. The campus has already been renovated and remodeled to provide an expanded mix of vocational and technical programs. This site would not be able to serve the needs of the general CCSF student population.

• The Southeast Campus is in leased space in a City-owned building; CCSF already leases 85 percent of the building to serve 1,200 students. This site would not be able to serve the projected increase of students at the Main Campus.

• The Downtown Campus serves about 6,300 students in a CCSF-owned building at 4th and Mission Streets. The campus provides training certification to meet the needs of local employers. This site would not be able to serve the needs of the general CCSF student population nor the projected increase of students at the Main Campus.

• The Fort Mason Campus provides art instruction and continuing education to about 2,000 students. This campus is in a relatively small, leased space at the Fort Mason Center. This site would not be able to serve the needs of the general CCSF student population nor the projected increase of students at the Main Campus.
• The John Adams Campus is in CCSF-owned facilities, and provides vocational training and training for the health care industry. The campus serves about 11,000 students. This site would not be able to serve the needs of the general CCSF student population nor the projected increase of students at the Main Campus.

• The approved Mission Campus project will accommodate the expected future growth and existing activities of the existing Mission Campus, which is currently divided among several leased spaces in the Mission District. Projected total daily student enrollment at the Mission Campus would increase to about 6,400 students from the current enrollment of 4,800 students. Therefore, this site would not be able to serve the projected increase of students at the Main Campus.

• The approved Chinatown/North Beach Campus represents the consolidation of classes held at nine satellite locations. In 1998, those sites served about 6,000 students; as of 2003, the nine satellite locations and a tenth location not included in the project served about 7,100 students. At the time of the 1999 EIR Addendum, the projected enrollment for 2020 at the Chinatown/North Beach Campus was 6,630 students. The approved development would not be able to accommodate the additional 13,500 students projected for the Main Campus.

• The Castro-Valencia Campus serves about 2,700 students but has the second highest credit enrollment among all of the CCSF campuses. There is already a need for additional facilities for this campus to serve the population of the Castro/Valencia/Noe Valley area.

Theoretically, some of the growth at the Main Campus could be spread among several of the other campuses, but this widespread distribution is not feasible from a practical standpoint because most of the other campuses offer specialized programs. In addition, the proposed Main Campus Master Plan projects are intended to serve the basic objective of replacing outdated and deteriorating facilities; this objective would not be met by channeling construction funding to other campuses.

**F. ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED IN DETAIL**

Three alternatives were evaluated in detail: the possible outcome should the proposed Master Plan not be approved by the College (Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative); construction of the near-term Master Plan projects only (Alternative 2, the Near-Term Development Only Alternative); and shifting most new space east of Phelan Avenue (Alternative 3, the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Alternative).
F1. Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Description

As noted in Section 15126.6 (e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR on projects other than a revision to an existing land use or regulatory plan (“for example a development project on identifiable property”) typically analyzes a No Project alternative that is “the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Here the discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the project is approved. If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this ‘no project’ consequence should be discussed.”

In this case, disapproval of the proposed project would mean that the College would not meet the City requirement for an Institutional Master Plan. In addition, there are existing conditions on the College campuses (such as the need for seismic upgrades) that require a response from the College. The practical result of this situation could be that an alternative Master Plan would be developed to meet the Institutional Master Plan requirement, or at least that some limited development would be undertaken to address existing conditions and accommodate some of the expected increase in enrollment at the College. Although these outcomes would likely involve the construction of new buildings, it would be speculative to state what buildings would be proposed or their locations.

CCSF projects an increase in enrollment at the Main Campus from about 36,900 to about 50,400 total students by 2015/2016. Increased enrollment is expected regardless of whether the Master Plan is approved; however, enrollment could grow more slowly as classes and classrooms become full. The proposed Master Plan projects are intended in part to accommodate the projected increase in enrollment. Under an alternative “no project” Master Plan scenario, the projected increase in enrollment would still occur; if limited or no development occurs, the increase in enrollment is likely to be lower than projected.

Discussion of Impacts

Land Use

Under the alternative Master Plan scenario, the projected increase in enrollment and associated increase in vehicle trips would still occur. Therefore, the potential impacts to neighborhood character from increased student and vehicle activity would still occur. The transportation demand management program proposed by the College and included as mitigation in Section 4.5 could help to reduce vehicle trips substantially, but the actual effectiveness of the program is not known at this time.
Under the no development or limited development scenario, enrollment and the associated vehicle trips would still increase, but to a lesser extent. There could still be impacts to neighborhood character from increased student and vehicle activity, but these impacts would be less than those of the project.

The EIR concludes that the proposed Master Plan could conflict with several City and County of San Francisco General Plan policies and Planning Code regulations (a list is provided under Alternative 2 below). The physical impacts related to these potential conflicts are addressed elsewhere in the EIR. Under the alternative Master Plan scenario, the projected increase in enrollment and associated increase in vehicle trips would still occur. Therefore, potential policy conflicts related to parking spillover and disruption in the adjacent neighborhood and air quality impacts would still occur. As noted below, the visual character impacts of the alternative Master Plan scenario would be similar to those of the proposed project; therefore, the associated policy conflicts would be similar. Under the alternative Master Plan scenario, it is likely that new facilities would be constructed, and given the constraints related to existing development on the campus and topography, it is also likely that the facilities would be built in locations similar to those proposed for the project. Therefore, this scenario would probably result in similar conflict with existing Planning Code height and bulk limits.

Under the no development scenario or a limited development scenario, these potential policy conflicts would not occur, or would occur to a lesser extent.

**Visual Quality**

Under the alternative Master Plan scenario, it is likely that new facilities would be constructed, and given the constraints related to existing development on the campus and topography, it is also likely that the facilities would be built in locations similar to those proposed for the project. Therefore, this scenario would probably result in similar impacts to mature trees and visual character. The impacts to trees would be adequately mitigated with the measures in Section 4.2; the impacts to visual character would be reduced by the measures in Section 4.2, but would remain significant in the absence of specific design information.

Under the no development scenario, impacts to mature trees and visual character would not occur. Under the limited development scenario, there would likely be some removal of mature trees, but the impact would be less than that of the project. Impact to visual character would not occur because the limited development would occur only east of Phelan Avenue.

**Transportation and Circulation**

Under the alternative Master Plan scenario, the projected increase in enrollment would still occur. Therefore, the cumulative impacts at the intersections of Phelan and Ocean Avenues I-280 Northbound
Ramps and Geneva Avenue and I-280 SB Ramps and Geneva Avenue would still occur. These impacts would be adequately mitigated by the improvements in Section 4.3, and implementation of the campus TDM program would help to reduce the number of future trips. However, implementation of the roadway improvements is under the jurisdiction of other agencies. Therefore, the impact would remain significant (same as for the project). Under the no development or limited development scenario, enrollment and the associated vehicle trips would still increase, but to a lesser extent. Depending on the amount of the enrollment increase, cumulative impacts at the three study intersections could still be significant.

Under the alternative Master Plan scenario, impacts related to on-site circulation, pedestrians, and parking would depend on the characteristics of the alternative Master Plan and would be speculative to determine at this time. Under the no development or limited development scenario, new parking garages would not be constructed, but there would still be increases in traffic at access points that are already congested (though to a lesser extent than with the project).

**Noise**

Under the alternative Master Plan scenario, it is likely that new facilities would be constructed. Therefore, there could still be significant impacts related to construction noise and groundborne noise and vibration. These impacts would be reduced with the standard control measures in Section 4.4, but would remain significant. The proposed project would not result in any significant operational noise impacts. The alternative Master Plan scenario would involve a similar increase in enrollment and the associated auto traffic, and thus would also not result in any significant operational noise impacts.

Under the no development scenario, the construction noise and vibration impacts of the project would not occur. Under the limited development scenario, construction noise and vibration impacts would occur, and on some days could be similar to those of the proposed project; however, the overall magnitude of the impacts would be less because fewer facilities would be constructed. The impact could still be unavoidably significant, though, especially if multiple buildings are constructed over an extended period.

Under the no development or limited development scenario, enrollment and the associated vehicle trips would still increase, but to a lesser extent. Therefore, noise impacts related to traffic levels and increased activity on the campus would be less than those of the project (less than significant).

**Air Quality**

Under the alternative Master Plan scenario, it is likely that new facilities would be constructed. Therefore, there could still be significant impacts related to construction dust. These impacts would be
adequately mitigated with the dust control program in Section 4.5. The projected increase in enrollment would still occur, with the associated increase in vehicle trips and air pollutant emissions. The transportation demand management program proposed by the College and included as mitigation in Section 4.5 could help to reduce vehicle trips substantially, but the actual effectiveness of the program is not known at this time.

Under the no development scenario, the construction dust impacts of the project would not occur. Under the limited development scenario, construction dust impacts would occur, and on some days could be similar to those of the proposed project; however, the overall magnitude of the impacts would be less because fewer facilities would be constructed.

Under the no development or limited development scenario, enrollment and the associated vehicle trips would still increase, but to a lesser extent. Therefore, air quality impacts from vehicles traveling to and from the campus would be less than those of the project. A 10 percent reduction in future trips would be enough to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Public Services and Utilities**

The proposed Master Plan would not result in any impacts related to police services. The alternative Master Plan scenario would likely involve a similar type and extent of construction on the campus, and the increase in enrollment would be the similar to that under the proposed project. Therefore, the alternative Master Plan scenario would not result in any significant impacts with respect to police services. Under the no development or limited development scenario, impacts on police services would be less than those of the project because enrollment would increase to a lesser extent. However, the problems cited by the Police Department with respect to the condition of their existing facilities might not be addressed.

Under the alternative Master Plan scenario, the projected increase in enrollment would still occur. Therefore, the potential impacts to San Francisco Fire Department services would still occur. CCSF’s “fair share” contribution toward construction of a new station included as mitigation in Section 4.6 could help to address the impact, but the construction of a new station would be under the jurisdiction of SFFD. Therefore, the impact would remain significant (same as for the proposed project). Under the no development or limited development scenario, impacts on fire services would be less than those of the project because enrollment would increase to a lesser extent. Depending on the extent of the increase in enrollment, a new station might still be needed.

Under the alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario, the increase in enrollment would be the same as that under the proposed project. The water provider to the campus has indicated that the project could be adequately served by the existing water supply and delivery systems. Therefore, the alternative
Master Plan scenario would not result in any significant impacts with respect to water supply or distribution. Under the no development or limited development scenario, enrollment and the associated demand for water would still increase, but to a lesser extent.

Under the alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario, the increase in enrollment would be the same as that under the proposed project. The wastewater provider to the campus has indicated that the project could be adequately served by the existing wastewater collection and treatment systems, but that the combined wastewater/stormwater lines near the campus are not adequate to handle wet weather flow during the 5-year storm event. The needed mitigation for this impact (upgrading of the lines) is the responsibility of the San Francisco Department of Public Works, which currently does not have adequate funds to upgrade the system. Therefore, the impact would remain significant after mitigation. Under the no development or limited development scenario, enrollment and the associated demand for wastewater collection and treatment would still increase, but to a lesser extent. The impact to the wastewater/stormwater lines would still be significant.

Geology, Seismicity and Soils

Under the alternative Master Plan scenario, it is likely that new facilities would be constructed, and given the constraints related to existing development on the campus and topography, it is also likely that the facilities would be built in locations similar to those proposed for the project. Geotechnical hazards related to project construction (liquefaction, slope stability, expansive soils) and construction-related erosion impacts would occur under this scenario, and would be adequately mitigated through measures in Section 4.7. Under the no development scenario, these impacts would not occur (though the campus would not realize the benefit of replacing aging structures). Under the limited development scenario, the extent of the impacts would depend on the number and location of buildings constructed (but would probably be less than those of the project).

Hazards

Under the alternative Master Plan scenario, it is likely that new facilities would be constructed, and given the constraints related to existing development on the campus and topography, it is also likely that the facilities would be built in locations similar to those proposed for the project. Potential hazards related to site contamination would occur under this scenario, and would be adequately mitigated through measures in Section 4.8. Under the no development scenario, these impacts would not occur. Under the limited development scenario, potential hazards related to site contamination would still occur, but to a lesser extent than with the project (because fewer buildings would be constructed).
Cultural Resources

Under the alternative Facilities Master Plan scenario, it is likely that new facilities would be constructed, and given the constraints related to existing development on the campus and topography, it is also likely that the facilities would be built in locations similar to those proposed for the project. Therefore, this scenario would probably result in similar impacts relating to the potential disturbance of archaeological resources and renovation of potentially historic structures. These impacts would be adequately mitigated through the measures in Section 4.9. Under the no development scenario, these impacts would not occur. Under the limited development scenario, potential disturbance of archaeological resources would still occur, but to a lesser extent than with the project (because fewer buildings would be constructed). If the Arts Complex were renovated under the limited development scenario, impacts to a potentially historic structure would still occur.

Other Impacts

The project would not result in any significant impacts related to agricultural resources, biological resources, hydrology or water quality, mineral resources, population and housing, or recreation (these topics were found to be less than significant in Section 5.0). The alternative Master Plan scenario would result in a similar level and type of construction on the campus. Under this scenario, the increase in enrollment would be similar to that under the proposed project. The no development scenario would involve no construction on the campus; the limited development scenario would result in some new construction but less than with the project. Under the no development and limited development scenarios, enrollment increases would still occur, but to a less extent than with the project. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not result in any significant impacts with respect to any of those resources.

Relationship to Project Objectives

The alternative Master Plan scenario could meet project objectives because the alternative plan would likely be similar to the proposed project (given the limited area available for building and the projected increase in enrollment). However, the need to develop an alternative Master Plan could require a substantial delay in project implementation.

The no development scenario would not meet the project objectives of providing for the long-term development of the City College campus, providing sufficient facilities to meet enrollment projections, and accommodating the projected increase in student enrollment at the Main Campus providing safe and up-to-date facilities, and increasing connections and interaction with the community. The limited development scenario would only partly meet these objectives.
6.0 Alternatives to the Project

F2. Alternative 2: Near-Term Development Only

Description

This alternative would attempt to avoid or reduce some of the significant impacts of the project by limiting future development to the “near-term projects” and building renovations. Under this alternative, the Community Health & Wellness Center, Student Health Center & Classroom Building (Health Center), and Child Development Center would be constructed, the practice field would be relocated, and the center berm between the two reservoir basins would be removed. In addition, the renovation of the Student Services complex and the Arts Complex would still occur. The proposed new facilities west of Phelan Avenue would not be built. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that at least some of the projected increase in enrollment at the Main Campus would still occur (but that the increase could be less than projected as classes and classrooms become full).

Discussion of Impacts

Land Use

Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the increase in enrollment and associated increase in vehicle trips would be similar to or less than the increases with the project. Therefore, the potential impacts to neighborhood character from increased student and vehicle activity could still occur. An increased parking deficit (because the eastern parking garage would not be built) could exacerbate parking spillover and the associated impacts to the neighborhood, resulting in greater land use impacts than with the project. The transportation demand management program proposed by the College and included as mitigation in Section 4.5 could help to reduce vehicle trips substantially, but the actual effectiveness of the program is not known at this time.

The EIR concludes that the proposed Master Plan could conflict with raise issues regarding several City and County of San Francisco General Plan policies and Planning Code regulations, including:

- Commerce and Industry Element, Policy 2 (disruption of nearby residential areas)
- Transportation Element, Policy 31.2 (parking spillover and disruption of nearby residential areas)
- Urban Design Element, Policy 2.5 (renovation and impacts to historic resources)
- Urban Design Element, Policies 3.5, 3.6, 3.8 (visual character impacts)
- Urban Design Element, Policies 4.1, 4.15 (disruption of nearby residential areas)
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- Environmental Protection Element, Policy 4.1 (air quality impacts)
- Environmental Protection Element, Policy 7.5 (slope stability and erosion impacts)
- Air Quality Element, Policy 5.1 (air quality construction impacts)
- Planning Code height limits (Academic Facility, Technology Center, Administration Building)
- Planning Code bulk requirements (Arts Center, Community Health & Wellness Center)

The physical impacts related to these potential conflicts are addressed elsewhere in the EIR. Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the increase in enrollment and associated increase in vehicle trips would be similar to or less than the increases with the project. Therefore, potential policy conflicts related to parking spillover and disruption in the adjacent neighborhood and air quality impacts would still occur. As noted below, the visual character impacts of the alternative would be less than those of the proposed project; therefore, the associated policy conflicts would also be reduced. Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the Academic Facility, Technology Center, Administration Building would not be constructed. Therefore, the alternative would not conflict with existing Planning Code height limits. The potential for exceedance of the bulk requirements would still occur for the Community Health & Wellness Center, but the Arts Center (which could exceed the bulk requirements) would not be constructed. Overall, the Near-Term Development Only alternative would result in fewer potential conflicts with City General Plan policies and Planning Code regulations.

Visual Quality

The Near-Term Development Only Alternative would not result in any new construction west of Phelan Avenue, and the associated impacts to the visual character of the area would not occur. (The Health Center and Child Development Center are relatively small buildings that would not in themselves substantially change the character of the area.) Therefore, the visual character impacts associated with the Near-Term Development Only Alternative would be less than the visual character impacts of the project. The development of the Community Health & Wellness Center, Health Center and Child Development center would result in the same impacts to mature trees as a visual resource as for the proposed project, and would be addressed by the mitigation measures in Section 4.2.

Transportation and Circulation

Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the projected increase in enrollment would be similar to or less than that of the project. Therefore, the cumulative impacts at the intersections of Phelan and Ocean Avenues, I-280 Northbound Ramps and Geneva Avenue, and I-280 SB Ramps and
Geneva Avenue could still occur. These impacts would be adequately mitigated by the measures in Section 4.3, and implementation of the campus TDM program would help to reduce the number of future trips. However, implementation of the roadway improvements is under the jurisdiction of other agencies. Therefore, the impact would remain significant (same as for the project). The Near-Term Alternative would not provide for an increase in parking spaces because the eastern parking garage would not be constructed, and the parking spillover condition in the adjacent neighborhood would be exacerbated. As noted in Section 4.3, this situation would not be considered a significant transportation impact. Under the Near-Term Alternative, the proposed parking garages would not be built, but there would still be increases in traffic at access points that are already congested.

Noise

Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the Community Health & Wellness Center, Student Health Center & Classroom Building (Health Center), and Child Development Center would be constructed, the practice field would be relocated, and the center berm between the two reservoir basins would be removed. Therefore, there could still be significant impacts related to construction noise and vibration (though they would be less than the project over time). As with the project, sensitive receptors north of Judson Avenue, west of the reservoir, and south of Ocean Avenue could be affected. These impacts would be reduced with the control measures in Section 4.4, but would remain significant after mitigation (same as for the proposed project). The proposed project would not result in any significant operational noise impacts. This alternative scenario would involve a similar increase in auto traffic, and thus would also not result in any significant operational noise impacts.

Air Quality

Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the Community Health & Wellness Center, Student Health Center & Classroom Building (Health Center), and Child Development Center would be constructed, the practice field would be relocated, and the center berm between the two reservoir basins would be removed. Therefore, there could still be significant impacts related to construction dust (though they would be less than the project over time). These impacts would be adequately mitigated with the dust control program in Section 4.5. The increase in enrollment and associated increase in vehicle trips (and air pollutant emissions) would be similar to or less than the increases with the project. The transportation demand management program proposed by the College and included as mitigation in Section 4.5 could help to reduce vehicle trips substantially, but the actual effectiveness of the program is not known at this time.
Public Services and Utilities

The proposed Master Plan would not result in any impacts related to police services. The Near-Term Development Only Alternative would involve construction of several of the buildings proposed for the project, and the increase in enrollment would be similar to or less than that under the proposed project. Therefore, the Near-Term Development Only Alternative would not result in any significant impacts with respect to police services. Compared to the project, the Near-Term Development Only Alternative may even result in a decrease in demand for police services because fewer buildings would be constructed.

Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the increase in enrollment would be similar to or less than the increase with the project. Therefore, the potential impacts to San Francisco Fire Department services would still occur. CCSF’s “fair share” contribution toward construction of a new station included as mitigation in Section 4.6 could help to address the impact, but the construction of a new station would be under the jurisdiction of SFFD. Therefore, the impact would remain significant (same as for the proposed project).

Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the increase in enrollment would be similar to or less than that under the proposed project. The water provider to the campus has indicated that the project could be adequately served by the water supply and distribution system currently serving the campus. Therefore, the Near-Term Development Only Alternative would not result in any significant impacts with respect to these utilities. The SFDPW has indicated that the existing wastewater/stormwater collection system is inadequate to convey the five-year storm, and the additional wastewater contributed by the project would exacerbate this impact. Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the wastewater generation could be similar to that of the project because the increase in enrollment could be similar. The needed mitigation for this impact (upgrading of the lines) is the responsibility of the San Francisco Department of Public Works, which currently does not have adequate funds to upgrade the system. Therefore, the impact would remain significant after mitigation (same as with the project).

Geology, Seismicity and Soils

Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the Community Health & Wellness Center, Student Health Center & Classroom Building (Health Center), and Child Development Center would be constructed, the practice field would be relocated, and the center berm between the two reservoir basins would be removed. The geotechnical hazards related to project construction at those sites (liquefaction, slope stability, expansive soils) and construction-related erosion impacts would still occur under this scenario, and would be adequately mitigated through measures in Section 4.7. The Academic
Facility (Joint Use), Advanced Technology Learning Center, Administration Building, Performing Arts Center, and eastern parking garage would not be constructed; the geotechnical hazards related to project construction at those sites (expansive soils) and construction-related erosion impacts would not occur under this scenario. Overall, geology, seismicity and soils impacts of this alternative would be less than the impacts of the project.

**Hazards**

Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the Community Health & Wellness Center, Student Health Center & Classroom Building (Health Center), and Child Development Center would be constructed, the practice field would be relocated, and the center berm between the two reservoir basins would be removed. Potential hazards related to site contamination at those sites (e.g., landfill gas at the site of the Community Health & Wellness Center) would occur under this scenario, and would be adequately mitigated through measures in Section 4.8. The Academic Facility (Joint Use), Advanced Technology Learning Center, Administration Building, Performing Arts Center, and eastern parking garage would not be constructed. The only suspected areas of contamination identified on these sites were those related to the North and South Gymnasiums (which would be demolished as part of the project so that the eastern garage could be built). However, there is potential for disturbance of contaminated areas at any of these sites; under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, this impact would not occur. Overall, the hazards impacts of this alternative would be less than the impacts of the project.

**Cultural Resources**

Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the Community Health & Wellness Center, Student Health Center & Classroom Building (Health Center), and Child Development Center would be constructed, the practice field would be relocated, and the center berm between the two reservoir basins would be removed. In addition, the proposed renovations to existing buildings would still occur. The Academic Facility (Joint Use), Advanced Technology Learning Center, Administration Building, Performing Arts Center, and eastern parking garage would not be constructed; these components of the proposed project would not have significant impacts on cultural resources. Therefore, this Alternative would result in similar impacts relating to the potential disturbance of archaeological resources and renovation of potentially historic structures. These impacts would be adequately mitigated through the measures in Section 4.9.

**Other Impacts**

The project would not result in any significant impacts related to agricultural resources, biological resources, hydrology or water quality, mineral resources, population and housing, or recreation (these
topics were found to be less than significant in Section 5.0). The Near-Term Development Only Alternative would result in less construction on the campus. Under this scenario, the increase in enrollment would be similar to or less than that under the proposed project. Therefore, the Near-Term Development Only Alternative would not result in any significant impacts with respect to any of those resources.

**Relationship to Project Objectives**

The Near-Term Development Only Alternative would result in the replacement of some aging facilities on the campus, and the classroom space that would be built would accommodate some of the projected growth in enrollment. For those reasons, the alternative would allow the College to partly meet the objectives of providing for the long-term development of the City College campus, providing sufficient facilities to meet enrollment projections, accommodating the projected increase in student enrollment at the Main Campus, providing safe and up-to-date facilities, and increasing connections and interaction with the community.

**F3. Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue**

**Description**

This alternative would attempt to avoid or reduce some of the significant impacts of the project by building east of Phelan Avenue only. Under this alternative, the “potential building sites” east of Phelan Avenue identified in the Land Use Element of the Master Plan would be used to fulfill the projected enrollment and program needs. Specifically, the site of the North and South Gymnasiums would be used for the proposed eastern parking garage with a one- to two-story academic building above it; the two small sites near the I-280 off-ramp would be used for administrative facilities; the site behind Cloud Hall would be used for an academic building of several stories; and the site of the existing Environmental Horticulture buildings would be used for an arts complex. This scenario is a rough conceptual set of proposals only, and is intended only to demonstrate the potential impacts of concentrating development east of Phelan Avenue.

**Discussion of Impacts**

**Land Use**

Under the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative, the projected increase in enrollment and associated increase in vehicle trips would still occur. Therefore, the potential impacts to neighborhood character from increased student and vehicle activity would still occur. These impacts
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could be greater than those of the project because the concentration of facilities east of Phelan Avenue might encourage more students to look for parking in the adjacent neighborhoods rather than park at the reservoir. The transportation demand management program proposed by the College and included as mitigation in Section 4.5 could help to reduce vehicle trips substantially, but the actual effectiveness of the program is not known at this time.

The EIR concludes that the proposed Master Plan could conflict with several City and County of San Francisco General Plan policies and Planning Code regulations, including:

- Commerce and Industry Element, Policy 2 (disruption of nearby residential areas)
- Transportation Element, Policy 31.2 (parking spillover and disruption of nearby residential areas)
- Urban Design Element, Policy 2.5 (renovation and impacts to historic resources)
- Urban Design Element, Policies 3.5, 3.6, 3.8 (visual character impacts)
- Urban Design Element, Policies 4.1, 4.15 (disruption of nearby residential areas)
- Environmental Protection Element, Policy 4.1 (air quality impacts)
- Environmental Protection Element, Policy 7.5 (slope stability and erosion impacts)
- Air Quality Element, Policy 5.1 (air quality construction impacts)
- Planning Code height limits (Academic Facility, Technology Center, Administration Building)
- Planning Code bulk requirements (Arts Center, Community Health & Wellness Center)

The physical impacts related to these potential conflicts are addressed elsewhere in the EIR. Under the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative, the projected increase in enrollment and associated increase in vehicle trips would still occur. Therefore, potential policy conflicts related to parking spillover and disruption in the adjacent neighborhood and air quality impacts would still occur (and could be greater than those of the project, due to the increased concentration of activity east of Phelan Avenue). As noted below, the visual character impacts of the alternative would be shifted from one part of the campus to another and thus would be similar to those of the proposed project; therefore, the associated policy conflicts would also be similar. Under the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative, the Academic Facility, Technology Center, and Administration Building would be constructed, but in different locations with greater height limits. Therefore, the alternative would not conflict with existing Planning Code height limits. The potential for exceedance of the bulk
requirements would still occur for the Community Health & Wellness Center and the Arts Center. In addition to the conflicts that could result from the project, this alternative could conflict with Urban Design Element Policies 2.4, 2.6, and 3.1 because the development of the site just east of Cloud Hall could significantly affect that historic resource. Overall, the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative could result in greater potential conflicts with City General Plan policies and Planning Code regulations.

Visual Quality

The Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative would not result in any new construction west of Phelan Avenue, and the associated impacts to the visual character of the area would not occur. (The Health Center and Child Development Center are relatively small buildings that would not in themselves substantially change the character of the area.) However, construction of the Arts Center on the site of the existing Horticultural buildings would place a large-scale structure in an area that is defined by smaller-scale buildings. Although the visual character impacts associated with the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative would be less than the visual character impacts of the project, some impacts would essentially be shifted from one area to another. The development of the Community Health & Wellness Center, Health Center and Child Development center would result in the same impacts to mature trees as a visual resource as for the proposed project, and would be addressed by the mitigation measures in Section 4.2.

Transportation and Circulation

Under the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative, the projected increase in enrollment would still occur. Therefore, the cumulative impacts at the intersections of Phelan and Ocean Avenues, I-280 Northbound Ramps and Geneva Avenue, and I-280 SB Ramps and Geneva Avenue would still occur. These impacts would be adequately mitigated by the measures in Section 4.3, and implementation of the campus TDM program would help to reduce the number of future trips. However, implementation of the roadway improvements is under the jurisdiction of other agencies. Therefore, the impact would remain significant (same as for the project). The alternative would provide for an increase in parking spaces because the eastern parking garage would be constructed and the reservoir parking spaces would remain. However, the parking spillover condition in the adjacent neighborhood could still be exacerbated because of the concentration of activity east of Phelan Avenue. As noted in Section 4.3, this situation would not be considered a significant transportation impact. The access impact to Havelock Street associated with the construction of the eastern parking garage would still occur; although mitigation for the impact has been identified, there are uncertainties attached to most of the measures. Therefore, the access impact would remain significant (same as for the project). The existing reservoir parking would continue to have one access point, and there could be backups along
Phelan Avenue due to the increased traffic and removal of a traffic lane for planned bike improvements. This impact would be similar to that of the project in nature, and would be addressed with the same mitigation measures identified for the project in Section 4.3.

Noise

Under the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative, all of the Master Plan projects would be built, but some of the buildings (Academic Facility, Advanced Technology, Administration, and Arts Center) would be sited in different locations. Therefore, there would still be significant impacts related to construction noise and vibration. As with the project, sensitive receptors north of Judson Avenue, west of the reservoir, and south of Ocean Avenue could be affected; however, impacts to receptors north of Judson Avenue would be greater due to construction of the Arts Center. These impacts would be reduced with the standard control measures in Section 4.4, but would remain significant after mitigation (same as for the proposed project). The proposed project would not result in any significant operational noise impacts. This alternative scenario would involve a similar increase in auto traffic, and thus would also not result in any significant operational noise impacts.

Air Quality

Under the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative, all of the Master Plan projects would be built, but some of the buildings (Academic Facility, Advanced Technology, Administration, and Arts Center) would be sited in different locations. Therefore, there would still be significant impacts related to construction dust (though they would be less than the project over time). These impacts would be adequately mitigated with the dust control program in Section 4.5. The projected increase in enrollment would still occur, with the associated increase in vehicle trips and air pollutant emissions. The transportation demand management program proposed by the College and included as mitigation in Section 4.5 could help to reduce vehicle trips substantially, but the actual effectiveness of the program is not known at this time.

Public Services and Utilities

The proposed Master Plan would not result in any impacts related to police services. The Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative would involve construction of all of the buildings proposed for the project, and the increase in enrollment would be similar to that under the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would not result in any significant impacts with respect to police services.

Under the Near-Term Development Only Alternative, the increase in enrollment would be the same as that under the proposed project. Therefore, the potential impacts to San Francisco Fire Department
services would still occur. CCSF’s “fair share” contribution toward construction of a new station included as mitigation in Section 4.6 could help to address the impact, but the construction of a new station would be under the jurisdiction of SFFD. Therefore, the impact would remain significant (same as for the proposed project).

Under the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative, the increase in enrollment would be the same as that under the proposed project. The water provider to the campus has indicated that the project could be adequately served by the water supply and distribution system currently serving the campus. Therefore, the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative would not result in any significant impacts with respect to these utilities.

The SFDPW has indicated that the existing wastewater/stormwater collection system is inadequate to convey the five-year storm, and the additional wastewater contributed by the project would exacerbate this impact. Under the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative, the wastewater generation could be similar to that of the project because the increase in enrollment would be the same. Therefore, the impact to the wastewater/stormwater collection system would be the same as that of the project.

Geology, Seismicity and Soils

Under the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative, all of the Master Plan projects would be built, but some of the buildings (Academic Facility, Advanced Technology, Administration, and Arts Center) would be sited in different locations. The geotechnical hazards related to project construction at the campus (liquefaction, slope stability, expansive soils) and construction-related erosion impacts would still occur under this scenario, and would be adequately mitigated through measures in Section 4.7. Overall, geology, seismicity and soils impacts of this alternative would be similar to the impacts of the project.

Hazards

Under the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative, all of the Master Plan projects would be built, but some of the buildings (Academic Facility, Advanced Technology, Administration, and Arts Center) would be sited in different locations. Potential hazards related to site contamination at those sites (e.g., landfill gas at the site of the Community Health & Wellness Center) would occur under this scenario, and would be adequately mitigated through measures in Section 4.8. The development of buildings adjacent to the I-280 off-ramp could also raise issues regarding landfill gas, as well as exposure to airborne lead from freeway traffic. The redevelopment of the Environmental Horticulture site could disturb shallow soils possible contaminated with pesticides. Overall, the hazards impacts of the alternative could be greater than the impacts of the project.
Cultural Resources

Under the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative, all of the Master Plan projects would be built, but some of the buildings (Academic Facility, Advanced Technology, Administration, and Arts Center) would be sited in different locations. In addition, the proposed renovations to existing buildings would still occur. Therefore, this Alternative would result in similar impacts relating to the potential disturbance of archaeological resources and renovation of potentially historic structures. These impacts would be adequately mitigated through the measures in Section 4.9. In addition, this alternative could result in new significant impacts to Cloud Hall because a new building would be developed directly adjacent to this historic resource. Overall, the cultural resource impacts of this alternative would be greater than those of the project.

Other Impacts

The project would not result in any significant impacts related to agricultural resources, biological resources, hydrology or water quality, mineral resources, population and housing, or recreation (these topics were found to be less than significant in Section 5.0). The Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative would result in similar construction on the campus (but shifted to different locations within the campus). Under this scenario, the increase in enrollment would be similar to that under the proposed project. Therefore, the Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Avenue Alternative would not result in any significant impacts with respect to any of those resources.

Relationship to Project Objectives

This alternative would meet the project objectives of providing for the long-term development of the City College campus, providing sufficient facilities to meet enrollment projections, accommodating the projected increase in student enrollment at the Main Campus, providing safe and up-to-date facilities, and increasing connections and interaction with the community. As this alternative is only conceptual, its ability to meet Master Plan design and land use goals is not known.

G. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis presented in this section, the following general conclusions can be made regarding the impacts of the alternatives. (For a comparative summary by impact, see Table 6.0-1, Comparison of Impacts of Project Alternatives.)

The No Project Alternative (alternative Master Plan) would likely result in impacts similar to those of the project, given the limited area available for construction and the similar increase in enrollment.
that would occur. The No Project Alternative (limited development) would likely result in impacts similar in type to those of the project, but of lesser extent, because enrollment growth would likely be less.

The Near-Term Development Only Alternative would result in a reduction in impacts to visual character and in other impacts related to the extent of construction. Impacts related to the projected increase in student enrollment (traffic congestion, air pollutant emissions, change in overall character of the vicinity) would still occur. In addition, some impacts could be worse than those of the project (e.g., impacts related to parking spillover) because enrollment would increase without a corresponding increase in the needed facilities.

The Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Alternative would generally result in impacts similar to those of the project, given that future enrollment would be similar and a full program of construction would occur. This alternative would eliminate the impact to visual character from development west of Phelan Avenue, but would essentially shift the impact to areas east of Phelan Avenue, where larger-scale structures could be constructed close to the smaller-scale, adjacent neighborhood. Some impacts would also be greater than those of the project because the available development sites east of Phelan Avenue pose constraints (historic resources, contamination).

Based on the analysis in this section, there would be tradeoffs involved with the adoption of any of the alternatives. As required by CEQA (Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e)(2)), the “environmentally superior” alternative must be selected from one of the alternatives to the project. Therefore, the Near-Term Development Only Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative (of the alternatives to the project) under CEQA.
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### Table 6.0-1
Comparison of Impacts of Project Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>ALT1 No Project</th>
<th>ALT1 No Project (alternative Master Plan)</th>
<th>ALT2 Near Term Only</th>
<th>ALT3 East of Phelan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on existing character</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU-</td>
<td>SU/SU+</td>
<td>SU+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Visual Quality/Shadow</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to scenic views</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to scenic resources</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to visual character</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>SU-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light and glare</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased shadow</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to local intersections</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit impacts</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking impacts</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS+</td>
<td>LS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian impacts</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS+</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle impacts</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS+</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading impacts</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS+</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction impacts</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS+</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway impacts</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion / hazards at garage access points</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU-</td>
<td>SU-</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative congestion at 3 intersections</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>SU-</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Noise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction noise</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU-</td>
<td>SU-</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundborne noise / vibration</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU-</td>
<td>SU-</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus traffic noise</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus traffic noise</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.0-1
Comparison of Impacts of Project Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>ALTI</th>
<th>ALTI1 No Project (alternative Master Plan)</th>
<th>ALTI2 Near Term Only</th>
<th>ALTI3 East of Phelan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-campus other noise</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus other noise</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Air Quality and Wind</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction emissions</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational emissions</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU-/S</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO concentrations</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxics</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary emissions</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odors</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Public Services/Utilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for fire services</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU-</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for police services</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS+/LS-</td>
<td>LS+/-LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to wastewater/stormwater lines</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU-</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater treatment capacity</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water facilities</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water entitlements</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Geology and Soils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismic ground shaking</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground failure</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope failure</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil erosion</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansive soils</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Hazards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials use</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to contamination</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.0-1
Comparison of Impacts of Project Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>ALT1 No Project (alternative Master Plan)</th>
<th>ALT1 No Project (limited/no development)</th>
<th>ALT2 Near Term Only</th>
<th>ALT3 East of Phelan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological resources</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic architectural resources</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
*Associated physical impacts are addressed elsewhere in the EIR.
ALT1 = No Project
ALT2 = Near-Term Development Only Alternative
ALT3 = Shifting of New Space East of Phelan Alternative
LS = Less than significant impact
S = Significant impact (can be mitigated)
SU = Significant unavoidable impact (with mitigation)
+ = Greater adverse impact than proposed project
- = Lesser adverse impact than proposed project
?? = Cannot be determined at this time

Source: Impact Sciences, Inc.
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