4.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, this section describes and evaluates a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project or project location that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives, and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to the project; rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). Furthermore, the purpose of the alternative discussion is to focus on alternatives to the project, or its location, which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effect of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b)). If an alternative is clearly environmentally superior to the proposed project, it is to be designated as such. CEQA also requires that a “No Project” alternative be evaluated and compared to the proposed project. If the alternative with the least environmental impact is the “No Project” alternative, then the environmentally superior alternative must be chosen from among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) (2)).

According to the state CEQA Guidelines, an EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process. The EIR should also briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination. A lead agency may use various factors and other considerations to remove an alternative from detailed considerations in an EIR. Such factors include, but are not limited to: failure of the alternative to meet most of the basic project objectives; inability of the alternative to avoid significant environmental impacts; and infeasibility. Each of these required components of an EIR alternatives analysis is discussed below.

4.1 Project Objectives

The 2009 Master Plan updates LAMC’s goals for the 2007 Master Plan for updating aging buildings and expanding educational and support facilities to accommodate a projected increase in students while preserving the suburban atmosphere of LAMC. The proposed 2009 Master Plan project objectives are presented in Section 2.2, Project Objectives.

4.2 Significant Impacts of the Proposed Project to be Avoided

Significant impacts of the proposed project are summarized in the Executive Summary and are more fully described in Section 3.0, Setting, Environmental Impact Analysis, Mitigation Measures. Section 3.16 identifies impacts that cannot be reduced to less-than-significant levels: aesthetics; air quality (including greenhouse gases); noise; and traffic.

4.3 Alternatives Considered

Alternatives to the proposed project that were considered were collected from several sources. These sources included alternatives required by CEQA, alternatives identified previously in the 2007 Master Plan EIR, alternatives suggested by community members, and off-site alternatives derived from research conducted in support of the 2009 Master Plan.
4.3.1 Alternatives Required by CEQA

As required by CEQA, a No Project alternative must be considered in an EIR.

Alternatives that would reduce significant effects of the project and meet most of the project objectives must be considered in an EIR. Alternatives that meet these criteria include:

- Avoid development of Nursery Property;
- Avoid development of ACOE parcel;
- Avoid development of both LACCD and ACOE Athletic Fields parcels; and/or
- Reduce development plans and avoid development of both Nursery and Athletic Fields properties.

4.3.2 Alternatives Previously Identified

Alternatives previously identified in the 2007 Master Plan EIR include:

- Compressed Plan at LAMC – The plan would accommodate growth on 22.5 acres of LAMC’s Main Campus site. Since growth would be limited to the existing campus area, there is not a lot of vacant space available on the campus to provide additional building area. Under this alternative, LAMC would have 560,100 gsf of building area.

- Add new site at Terra Vista – This alternative considers future development at a site located at the intersection of Terra Vista Street and Pierce Street, a site approximately 5 miles from the LAMC campus. This site would require extensive grading due to its hillside layout, and has approximately 15 acres of land zoned as Residential/Estate (RE).

- Expand Remote Campus Centers – The Remote Campus Centers would implement the proposed LAMC programs within one or more of the three off-campus centers that are between one to three miles distance from the Main Campus.

- Reduced Build-out within Existing Campus – This alternative would reduce overall development and enrollment relative to the proposed project by restricting all development within the LAMC Campus boundaries. Parking Structure B and the Health, Fitness, and Athletics Building considered would be eliminated. Development would consist of the addition of 218,702 gsf of building space (five structures) for a total of 508,407 gsf.

4.3.3 Alternatives Suggested by Community

Through the scoping meeting process, the public had an opportunity to submit ideas for alternatives to the proposed project. Alternatives identified by community members include:

Alternative Location for College Programs and Activities Center

- Land between Eldridge Avenue and Gladstone Avenue
Alternative Locations for Athletic Fields

- El Cariso Park ball fields;
- Land towards the Pacoima Wash; and
- Fields in Pasadena, south of the 405 freeway, and universities such as UCLA.

Alternative Locations for College Programs and Activities Center and Athletic Fields

- Areas east of school or south near Polk, or sites in remote areas east of Sylmar; and
- El Cariso Park Golf Course

Alternative Uses of Athletic Field Sites

- Ecological preserve and botanical garden (“passive park”)

4.3.4 Other Off-site Alternatives

A search was conducted for additional potential sites that could minimize impacts on adjoining neighborhoods and meet project objectives. The goal of this search was to identify sites near LAMC that could accommodate a reasonable portion of the projected growth. The first step in the search was to develop screening criteria to ensure that alternatives identified would enable project objectives to be met. The following site selection screening criteria were used:

- Located within the community of Sylmar, the City of San Fernando, or within a 5-mile radius of the LAMC campus (maximum radius to serve the local community);
- Vacant parcel (avoids potential infeasibility and demolition constraints);
- To accommodate the campus support function of the Nursery Property, or 14.6 acres to accommodate the Athletic Fields; and
- Located in an urbanized area with access to public infrastructure.

4.3.5 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

Alternatives that were considered but rejected include:

4.3.5.1 Other Sites

- Add new site at Terra Vista (between Terra Vista Street and Pierce Street, approximately 5 miles from the LAMC campus). The Terra Vista Alternative would add other aesthetic impacts and would not provide conveniently located LAMC facilities, and thereby not meet project objectives.

- Land between Eldridge Avenue and Gladstone Avenue. This alternative would not meet most of the project objectives because it would involve opening a new campus area that would not be consolidated with the existing campuses. The use of vacant lands between Eldridge Avenue and Gladstone Avenue would create additional traffic and noise concerns for the surrounding community since students and staff would be traveling back and forth between the College Programs building and the Main Campus, and for the Athletic Fields there would be no buffer between the fields and the existing neighborhood. The vacant parcels located in this area would not be large enough to provide space for Athletic Fields.
and related amenities without acquisition of parcels containing structures. The proposed location for the Campus Programs building and Athletic Fields would be more conveniently located, as they would be easily accessible by students in the Main and East Campus areas, respectively. If the vacant parcels between Eldridge Avenue and Gladstone Avenue were chosen as an alternative, students would have to travel through residential neighborhood streets in order to access the site, whereas the current proposed location is accessible using Eldridge Avenue and Maclay Street.

- El Cariso Park Ball Fields. This alternative would not be feasible since the park does not have soccer fields to meet the needs of LAMC athletes; it would therefore not meet the objective of providing conveniently located fields for LAMC students, as remote soccer facilities would still have to be used.

- Fields in Pasadena, south of the 405 Freeway, and universities such as UCLA. This alternative would not meet the important objectives of providing parking for the Heath, Fitness, and Athletics Building and providing conveniently located ball fields for LAMC students.

- El Cariso Golf Course. This alternative would not be feasible because this public open space and recreation amenity is currently available to the community. Conversion of this space to Campus Athletic Fields, although retaining the character of open space, would preclude public recreation. This loss of a public amenity would be an impact to the community.

- Use Fields Elsewhere in the Region. This alternative would not be feasible as no sites within 10 miles of the proposed project area could provide convenient accommodation and access for LAMC students or for Athletic Fields development.

### 4.3.5.2 Reduced Development

- Compressed Plan at LAMC/Reduced Build-out within Existing Campus. Under the Compressed Plan, growth would be limited to the existing campus area; some changes to existing buildings would have to be made due to constrained development areas. The Reduced Build-out alternative would not include development of Parking Structure B and the Heath, Fitness, and Athletics Building. Either the Compressed Plan alternative or the Reduced Build-out alternative are feasible as there is insufficient space on campus to accommodate the housing the demand for college programs or for new athletic fields.

- Ecological preserve and botanical garden (“passive park”). This alternative would not be feasible for either the ACOE or LACCD parcels, as neither the ACOE nor LACCD have plans, funding, or missions to develop their properties as a park for use by the general community. This alternative would also not meet the important objectives of providing parking for the Heath, Fitness, and Athletics Building and for providing conveniently located ball fields for LAMC students.

### 4.4 Alternatives Analyzed

Through the screening process described above, a reasonable range of alternatives was selected for further analysis. Alternative 1 (No Project) is selected to be analyzed as required by CEQA. Other alternatives are selected in order to consider ways to reduce potential impacts of the proposed 2009 Master Plan. These alternatives would meet most of the project objectives and would also have the potential to reduce at least one significant environmental effect of the project:
4.0 Project Alternatives

- Alternative 1 – No Project;
- Alternative 2 – No ACOE Parcel Alternative;
- Alternative 3 – No Athletic Fields Development Alternative;
- Alternative 4 – No Nursery Property Alternative; and
- Alternative 5 – Reduced Development Alternative.

4.4.1 Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed 2009 Master Plan would not be implemented. CEQA Guidelines indicate that a No Project Alternative should gauge what would be reasonably 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. In this case, under Alternative 1, build-out of the previously approved 2007 Master Plan, would be completed. The facilities to be built out are described in the current 2007 Master Plan, and the 2007 Master Plan EIR and Addendum.

The 2007 Master Plan allows construction of approximately 609,140 gsf. The existing LAMC Campus consists of approximately 418,250 gsf of permanent and temporary building space, of which approximately 25,600 gsf is attributable to temporary structures. Therefore, under Alternative 1, new construction of approximately 216,490 gsf of permanent building space would be developed. This would be a reduction of 32,200 gsf, compared to the proposed project.

For build-out of the 2007 Master Plan, the District has already approved 5 construction projects. These construction projects consist of:

- Media Arts Center;
- Student Services and Administration Building;
- Plant Facilities with Central Plant;
- Science and Math Technology Center; and
- East Campus Central Plant.

Under this alternative, LAMC would continue to operate in a manner similar to present conditions, but would become more congested as improvements are made. Improvements, upgrades, and renovations would be consistent with the current 2007 Master Plan. The Nursery Property, East Campus, Eldridge Avenue, and Athletic Fields sites would remain in their existing condition and use. Alternative 1 would not involve any new land acquisition or leases with the ACOE.

The Nursery Property would not be available as temporary “swing space” for the relocation of temporary modular buildings. During construction of buildings where these modulars are currently located, the modulars would be moved elsewhere on site, moved off-site, or relinquished. Since space for the relocation of the modulars would be unavailable, the college would likely lease or rent vacant commercial space in the area to temporarily house faculty. After the 2007 Master Plan improvements are completed, faculty would be moved to the new permanent buildings on campus. Long-term development of the Nursery Property includes a College Programs and Activities Center, which would not occur under this alternative. As a result, the college may not have sufficient space
to accommodate new programs and would either look for off-site facilities to develop these programs or opt for not having additional programs.

Under this alternative, development of the Athletic Fields would also not occur. This would result in no temporary parking for the Health, Fitness and Athletics Building, which would affect traffic and parking flows. In addition, this alternative would require continued and potentially increased use and lease of county and/or other off-site athletic fields.

4.4.2 Alternative 2 – No ACOE Property Alternative (Implementation of Master Plan with Athletic Fields on LACCD Property Only)

Under this alternative, LAMC would not lease the ACOE parcel. All other aspects of the proposed 2009 Master Plan would be implemented.

This alternative would differ from existing conditions and the No Project Alternative in the following ways:

- A smaller set of athletic fields would be constructed for use by the college on the LACCD parcel;
- Lighting, parking, and other ancillary structures would be constructed on the LACCD Athletic Fields;
- Reconstruction of roadways, all revetments, and utilities would occur on LACCD and ACOE parcels;
- Any fields developed on the LACCD parcel would not need to be leased from county or other off-site fields;
- Eldridge Avenue Streetscape Improvements would be made; and
- Development would occur on the Nursery Property (temporary swing space, and build-out of campus buildings for academic use such as the College Programs and Activities Center).

This alternative would differ from the proposed 2009 Master Plan in the following ways:

- No temporary parking would be provided for the Health, Fitness and Athletics Building, which would affect traffic and parking flows;
- The ACOE parcel would remain in a passive, unused state; and
- Passive recreational use of the ACOE parcel would continue.

4.4.3 Alternative 3 – No Athletic Fields Development Alternative (Implementation of 2009 Master Plan with No Development of Athletic Fields)

Under this alternative, there would be no Athletic Fields development. All other aspects of the proposed 2009 Master Plan would be implemented.
This alternative would differ from existing conditions and the No Project Alternative in the following ways:

- Eldridge Avenue Streetscape Improvements would be made; and
- Development would occur on the Nursery Property (temporary swing space, and build-out of campus buildings for academic use such as the College Programs and Activities Center).

This alternative would differ from the proposed 2009 Master Plan in the following ways:

- No temporary parking for Health, Fitness and Athletics Building, which would affect traffic and parking flows;
- Use of county or other off-site athletic fields would continue as described by the No Action Alternative; and
- The parcels along the Pacoima Wash would remain in a passive, unused state.

4.4.4 Alternative 4 – No Nursery Property Alternative (Implementation of 2009 Master Plan with no Development of Nursery Property)

Under this alternative, the Nursery Property would not be available as temporary swing space for the relocation of Faculty and Sheriff’s Station temporary modular buildings or long-term development of a College Programs and Activities Center All other aspects of the proposed project would be implemented.

This alternative would differ from existing conditions and the No Project Alternative in the following ways:

- Softball, baseball, and soccer fields would be constructed for use by the college on LACCD and ACOE parcels;
- Lighting, parking, and other ancillary structures would be constructed for the Athletic Fields;
- Reconstruction of roadways, all revetments, and utilities would occur on LACCD and ACOE properties;
- Baseball fields, softball fields, and soccer fields would not need to be leased from county or other off-site fields; and
- Eldridge Avenue Streetscape Improvements would be made.

This alternative would differ from the proposed 2009 Master Plan in the following ways:

- The Nursery Property would not be available as temporary swing space for the relocation of the temporary modular buildings as described by the No Action Alternative, which would require staff and students located in these buildings to disperse onsite and offsite; and
- No permanent development of the Nursery Property for a College Programs and Activities Center.
4.4.5 Alternative 5 – Reduced Development (No development/use of Athletic Fields Complex or Nursery Property; Remote Learning Programming and Expansion of Other Campuses in the LACCD, Continued Use of County Parks for Athletic Program)

This alternative would differ from existing conditions and the No Project Alternative in the following ways:

- The temporary modular buildings would be moved elsewhere on-site, moved off-site, or relinquished; space for the relocation of the modulars would be unavailable;
- LAMC would likely need to find space in the area to temporarily house faculty; and
- Use and lease of county and/or other off-site athletic fields would continue.

This alternative would differ from the proposed 2009 Master Plan in the following ways:

- No permanent development of the Nursery Property for a College Programs and Activities Center would occur;
- LAMC may not have sufficient space to accommodate new programs, and would either look for off-site facilities to develop these programs or opt for not having additional programs;
- No temporary parking for Health, Fitness and Athletics Building would be provided, which would affect traffic and parking flows; and
- Use of county or other off-site athletic fields would continue as described by the No Action Alternative.

4.4.6 Comparison of Alternatives

For each of the five reasonable alternatives recommended for development (Sections 4.4.1 to 4.4.5), the alternative analysis describes the environmental impacts of the proposed alternatives compared to the existing conditions in March 2009 (per CEQA), and indicate the alternative that has the least significant impacts (environmentally superior). In addition, the alternative analysis clearly states if the alternatives reduce any significant effect on the environment of the proposed project.

4.5 Alternative Analysis

The following subsections present the alternatives for consideration. The comparative merits of the alternatives are evaluated and summarized. The alternative is then assessed based on their potential to achieve the purpose, need, and objectives of the project. Following the evaluation of a selected alternative, a significance determination is assigned based on the level of impacts prescribed and the mitigation measures imposed. A detailed description of each alternative summarized in Section 4.5 is available in Section 3.01 to Section 3.05.

4.5.1 No Project Alternative

4.5.1.1 Aesthetics

No adverse aesthetic impacts would occur to the Nursery Property or Athletic Fields sites. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.
4.5.1.2 **Air Quality**

The air quality in the project vicinity would remain the same. No new air-quality impacts would occur from construction or operation. Significant impacts would occur relating to GHG emissions from college-related traffic. Other air-quality impacts would occur as identified in the 2007 Master Plan. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.1.3 **Biological Resources**

This project alternative would not result in adverse impacts to the Main Campus, East Campus, Nursery Property, Eldridge Avenue Streetscape Improvements, or the Athletic Fields sites. Since the No Project Alternative would not adversely impact trees, shrubs, plants, raptors, and birds, or animals in the vicinity of the study area, no impacts would be expected. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.1.4 **Cultural Resources**

The project alternative would not result in adverse impact to archaeological or paleontological resources. Since no physical alteration (i.e., grading or excavation) would occur, no construction impacts are anticipated. The project alternative would not adversely impact historic structures, since there are no potentially historic structures within the proposed 2009 Master Plan site. No operational impacts are anticipated. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.1.5 **Energy, Conservation, and Sustainability**

This alternative would not result in adverse impacts with regards to energy, conservation, and sustainability, with the exception that the Health, Physical Education and Fitness Center Building, would not meet the LEED Silver criteria by two LEED points, a significant impact. With implementation of mitigation to generate at least 7.5 percent of the energy demand for the Health, Physical Education, and Fitness Building using on-site renewable energy sources, impact would be reduced to less-than-significant level. Impacts would be greater than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.1.6 **Geology and Soils**

This alternative would result in a significant adverse impact since impacts from earthquakes, seiches, and flooding would erode the Athletic Fields sites. Impacts would be greater than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.1.7 **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

This alternative would not result in adverse construction, operational, or cumulative impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.1.8 **Hydrology and Water Quality**

This alternative would not result in adverse impact to the Main Campus, Nursery Property, East Campus, or Eldridge Avenue sites because these are already developed sites. The Athletic Field sites are within a currently mapped flood inundation area and would incur periodic flooding, resulting in continuing erosion, which could impact water quality and hydrology. Since these sites are currently
designed and managed as a flood-control debris basin, these impacts are considered to be less than significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

### 4.5.1.9 Land Use and Planning

Current land uses within LAMC and Athletic Fields are compatible and there would be no change in land-use planning; therefore, no impacts to land-use planning would occur. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

### 4.5.1.10 Mineral Resources

The No Project alternative would not result in adverse impact to mineral resources because it would not reduce the risk of loss of availability of a known mineral resource. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

### 4.5.1.11 Noise

The noise exposure levels for the existing noise-sensitive land uses would remain at their current levels. There would be no new impacts from construction and operation. No significant impacts would occur. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

### 4.5.1.12 Public Services

The No Project Alternative would not result in adverse impacts to fire, police, parks, and the currently vacant Athletic Field sites because there would be no increase in demand for public services. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

### 4.5.1.13 Recreation

This alternative would result in some adverse impact to recreational facilities due to continued use of off-site facilities. There would be continued increase in utilization of local parks and other athletic field sites. This alternative would require continued use of county parks and facilities that would not be under control of LAMC. Since no new facilities would be built, these potential impacts to recreation would be less than significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

### 4.5.1.14 Transportation and Traffic

This alternative would result in new adverse impacts to transportation and traffic during operation related to cumulative impacts of traffic along Hubbard Street, between Gladstone Avenue and Fenton Avenue and along Maclay Avenue, between Gladstone Avenue and Fenton Avenue. Temporary significant impacts would also occur from the lack of parking space available immediately after the Heath, Fitness, and Athletics Building building is completed. These would be significant impacts. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

### 4.5.1.15 Utilities and Service Systems

Demand for these systems would continue as forecast. No significant impacts would be expected. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.
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4.5.2 No ACOE Property Alternative (Implementation of Master Plan with Athletic Fields on LACCD Property Only)

4.5.2.1 Aesthetics
Potentially significant impacts would occur at the LACCD portion of the Athletic Fields site from degradation of existing visual character, lighting, and effects on Community Plan policy. These impacts cannot all be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.2.2 Air Quality
There would still be temporary impact to air quality from construction associated with the development of the LACCD portion of the Athletic Fields to the sensitive receptors on the east side of the campus. There would also be temporary construction air impacts to the sensitive receptors on the west side of campus adjacent to the Nursery Property, and along Eldridge Avenue, south of campus. There would still be exposure to long-term operational impacts to all receptors in the area. Impacts would be potentially significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.2.3 Biological Resources
This alternative would result in potential adverse impacts to locally protected trees, birds, plants, and animals on the LACCD portion of the Athletic Fields site. Noise, dust, and vibration resulting from construction and operational activities could temporarily deter individual animals from utilizing the project area. Some displacement may occur with impediments to animal movement. These impacts would be less than significant with the same mitigation suggested for the proposed project. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.2.4 Cultural Resources
This alternative would result in potentially adverse impact in previously undisturbed areas at the LACCD portion of the Athletic Fields site. Archaeological impacts could also occur at the Nursery Property. Impacts would be similar to those of the project in relation to Cultural Resources, and could be mitigated in a similar manner to less-than-significant levels. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.2.5 Energy, Conservation, and Sustainability
This alternative would result in potentially adverse impact to energy, conservation, and sustainability. Existing county park facilities would not be as energy efficient as the LACCD portion of the Athletic Fields because they would not utilize on-site renewable energy generation. Since the incremental increase in energy use would be small, this impact would be less than significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.2.6 Geology and Soils
The alternative would have the same adverse impacts involving geology and soils on the Nursery Property as the proposed 2009 Master Plan, which can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Liquefaction, landslides, seiches, and erosion from seismic events, shallow groundwater, and potentially liquefiable loose sands would continue to be present at the Athletics Fields sites. The Pacoima Wash bank protection measures would mean that erosion impacts would be at less than-
significant-levels, but other impacts would be significant, prior to mitigation. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

**4.5.2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Since operations at the Nursery Property and LACCD portion of the Athletic Fields would occur, impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project and would be less than significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

**4.5.2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality**

If the ACOE property is not developed for Athletic Fields, there would be no net change to the current water quality and hydrologic impacts from that property. Since the revetment would protect both the LACCD portion of the Athletic Fields and the ACOE parcel, impacts relating to water quality from erosion would be reduced. The ACOE parcel is currently designed and managed as a flood-control debris basin and the impacts from this use would not change. The impacts from the other proposed 2009 Master Plan facilities would not change. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Impact would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

**4.5.2.9 Land Use and Planning**

The current land-use designation of the ACOE parcel as a recreational resource area is compatible and there would be no change in land-use planning under this alternative. The ACOE parcel would remain designated as a recreational resource area and the college would continue to have access to the LACCD portion of the Athletic Fields. No land-use impacts would occur from this alternative. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

**4.5.2.10 Mineral Resources**

This alternative would result in potential adverse impacts to mineral resources. While this alternative would reduce the area impacted by the loss of availability of a known mineral resource, the loss of mineral resources available at the LACCD portion of the Athletic Fields site is minor, compared to the aggregate mineral resources present in the region. Impact could be mitigated to less than significant. Impact would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

**4.5.2.11 Noise**

There would still be temporary construction noise impacts to the noise-sensitive land uses on the east side of campus associated with the development of the LACCD portion of the Athletic Fields. There would be temporary construction noise impacts to the noise-sensitive land uses on the west side of campus adjacent to the Nursery Property, and along Eldridge Avenue south of the campus. Impacts would be significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

**4.5.2.12 Public Services**

This alternative would not result in potentially significant construction and operational impacts to fire, police protection, or patrolling services. Expansion of the LACCD portion of the Athletic Fields would adhere to operational and construction standards. As a result, existing and planned services would be sufficient to provide adequate services during construction and operation. Less-
than-significant impacts are anticipated. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.2.13 Recreation

Under this alternative, there would be continued utilization of local parks for baseball. The ACOE parcel site would remain undeveloped as open space. Since the other proposed 2009 Master Plan facilities would not increase the use of local parks, this alternative would not cause significant impacts. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.2.14 Transportation and Traffic

This alternative would result in the same potentially significant adverse impacts to transportation and traffic as the proposed 2009 Master Plan, which cannot be completely mitigated to less-than-significant levels.

This alternative includes the temporary significant impact of the loss of parking at the ACOE portion of the Athletic Fields. This loss would result in new additional operational impacts from inadequate parking in Maclay Street and Eldridge Avenue for the Heath, Fitness, and Athletics Building until new parking is developed at that site. This impact would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level using the same measures suggested for the proposed 2009 Master Plan. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.2.15 Utilities and Service Systems

This alternative would result in potentially adverse impacts. There would be a slight reduction in overall demand for water, wastewater, and landfill disposal capacity compared to the proposed 2009 Master Plan as a result of the decreased development area. Since this demand can be accommodated by existing systems, this alternative would result in less-than-significant impacts. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.3 No Athletic Fields Development Alternative (Implementation of Master Plan with No Development of Athletic Fields)

4.5.3.1 Aesthetics

Significant impacts would occur at the Nursery Property from development of the proposed facility and changing the visual character of the surrounding neighborhood. Significant aesthetic impacts associated with the development of the athletic fields would be avoided. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.3.2 Air Quality

Since there would be no temporary air impacts to the sensitive receptors from construction of the Athletic Fields, construction-related air-quality impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan, but would remain potentially significant following mitigation. There would still be temporary constructional air-quality impacts to the sensitive receptors on the west side of the campus adjacent to the Nursery Property, and along Eldridge Avenue south of the campus. GHG emissions from construction would be present but would be reduced, compared to the proposed 2009 Master Plan. Since travel to remote fields would continue, significant impacts from GHG emissions during operations would be greater than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.
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4.5.3.3 Biological Resources
Since no development would occur on the Athletic Fields sites, no impacts would occur. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.3.4 Cultural Resources
Since no excavation would occur in previously undisturbed soils, no direct or indirect impacts to undiscovered on-site archaeological or paleontological resources within the Athletic Fields would occur. This alternative would result in potential impacts to the Nursery Property, similar to the proposed 2009 Master Plan and would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.3.5 Energy, Conservation, and Sustainability
This alternative would result in potentially adverse impacts to energy, conservation, and sustainability. Under this alternative, LAMC would be forced to use the county’s fields that would not be as energy efficient and do not utilize on-site renewable energy generation. Since the incremental increase in energy use would be small, construction impacts would be less than significant. Since the Health, Physical Education and Fitness Center Building would not meet LEED Silver criteria, operation of this facility would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.3.6 Geology and Soils
The alternative would have the same adverse impacts involving geology and soils on the Nursery Property as the proposed 2009 Master Plan, which can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Liquefaction, landslides, seiches, and erosion from seismic events, shallow groundwater, and potentially liquefiable loose sands would continue to be present at the Athletic Fields site. These impacts can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Since operations at the Nursery Property would still occur, impacts would be similar to those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan and would be less than significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.3.8 Hydrology and Water Quality
This alternative would result in some continuing adverse impacts to hydrology and water quality since erosion would continue in the absence of bank protection. The Athletic Field sites are currently designed and managed for flood-control debris basin and the impacts from this use would not change. Therefore, these impacts are considered to be less than significant. The impacts from the other proposed 2009 Master Plan facilities would not change. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.3.9 Land Use and Planning
The proposed Athletic Fields sites are better suited for development of playfields, and the use of other facilities for playfields could create adverse land-use impacts on the surrounding community, with respect to potential compatibility issues. Under this alternative, the existing sites would remain
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4.5.3.10 Mineral Resources

This alternative would not result in the risk of loss of known mineral resources. No impact would occur. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.3.11 Noise

There would be no temporary construction noise impacts to the noise-sensitive land uses on the east side of the campus associated with the development of the Athletic Fields. There would still be temporary construction noise impacts to the noise-sensitive land uses on the west side of the campus adjacent to the Nursery Property, and along Eldridge Avenue south of the campus. Therefore, noise impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan, but would still be significant.

4.5.3.12 Public Services

This alternative would result in no potentially adverse impact with regards to fire, police, parks, or other passive recreational resources. The planned resources would be sufficient to provide adequate public services during construction and operational phases. Less-than-significant impacts would occur. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.3.13 Recreation

This alternative would continue the existing adverse impacts in relation to recreation. While there would be no increase in utilization of local parks, this alternative would require continued use of county parks and athletic programs, and would not contribute to LAMC’s need for recreational facilities. Impacts would be less than significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.3.14 Transportation and Traffic

This alternative would result in the same potentially adverse impacts to transportation and traffic as the proposed 2009 Master Plan, which cannot be mitigated completely to less-than-significant levels.

The lack of temporary parking for the Health, Fitness and Athletics Building, would affect traffic and parking flows. Inadequate parking would cause users to seek parking on surrounding roadways including Maclay Street and Eldridge Avenue. Overall operational and cumulative impacts would be greater than the proposed 2009 Master Plan due to the inadequate parking. These potentially significant impacts would be mitigated using measures proposed for the proposed 2009 Master Plan. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.3.15 Utilities and Service Systems

This alternative would result in potential adverse impacts to water, wastewater, and landfill activity due to expansion of the Nursery Property site and continued LAMC operations. Projected utility demands based on standard consumption and generation rates would be generally sufficiently accommodated by existing services and utilities. Comparatively, utility impacts associated with this alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed 2009 Master Plan. Impacts due to
this alternative would also be less than significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.4 No Nursery Property Alternative (Implementation of 2009 Master Plan with no Development of Nursery Property)

4.5.4.1 Aesthetics

Potentially significant impacts would occur at the Athletic Fields from degradation of existing visual character, lighting, and effects on Community Plan policy. These impacts cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan. The significant aesthetic impact of developing the college facilities within the residential block would be avoided. Aesthetic impacts would be less than the proposed project.

4.5.4.2 Air Quality

There would be no temporary construction and operational impacts to the sensitive receptors on the west side of the campus adjacent to the Nursery Property. There would still be temporary constructional impacts to the sensitive receptors near the Athletic Fields, and along Eldridge Avenue south of the campus. GHG emissions from construction would be reduced compared to the proposed 2009 Master Plan. There would still be exposure to long-term operational impacts to all receptors in the area. Impacts would be less-than-significant than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan, but would still remain significant. Impacts would be potentially significant following mitigation. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.4.3 Biological Resources

This alternative would result in potential adverse impacts to locally protected trees, birds, plants, and animals on the Athletic Fields site. Noise, dust, and vibration resulting from construction and operational activities could temporarily deter individual animals from utilizing the project area. Some displacement may occur, with impediments to animal movement. These impacts would be less than significant with the same mitigation suggested for the proposed 2009 Master Plan. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.4.4 Cultural Resources

This alternative would result in potential adverse impacts to cultural resources at the Athletic Fields, which can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.4.5 Energy, Conservation, and Sustainability

This alternative would result in potentially adverse impacts with regards to energy, conservation, and sustainability, as this alternative would likely lead to an increase in wasteful, inefficient, and/or unnecessary consumption of energy. As the LAMC College Programs and Activities Center would either be located farther from the campus or in other colleges, LAMC students could be forced to travel farther from their homes, leading to an increase in consumption of energy for transportation. Since the Nursery Property represents about 5 percent of the total campus building square footage, the net effect of these changes would be less than significant.
Since the Health, Physical Education and Fitness Center Building would not meet LEED Silver criteria, operation of this facility would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

**4.5.4.6 Geology and Soils**

This alternative would avoid significant impacts at this site with regards to geology and soils involving surface deformation, ground shaking, earthquakes, and other geologic and seismic forces at the Nursery Property. Effects of liquefaction, landslides, seiches, and erosion from seismic events, shallow groundwater, and potentially liquefiable loose sands would occur at the Athletics Fields sites. These impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after mitigation. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

**4.5.4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Since operations at the Athletic Fields would occur, impacts from hazards at this site would be similar to those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan and would be less than significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

**4.5.4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality**

This alternative would result in no net changes with regards to the current water quality and hydrologic impacts from the property. Impacts at the Athletic Fields sites would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan and would be less than significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

**4.5.4.9 Land Use and Planning**

During the development of the current 2007 Master Plan, LAMC would require additional space for classrooms, campus departments, and administrative uses. Under this alternative, LAMC would not have the necessary additional swing space for campus departments and functions that would be displaced by the development of the current 2007 Master Plan. Potentially significant impacts to land-use planning would occur. Impacts would be the greater than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

**4.5.4.10 Mineral Resources**

This alternative would have a less-than-significant impact to the loss of availability of a known mineral resource as the proposed 2009 Master Plan. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

**4.5.4.11 Noise**

There would be no temporary construction noise impacts to the noise-sensitive land uses on the west side of the campus adjacent to the Nursery Property. There would still be temporary construction noise impacts to the noise-sensitive land uses on the east side of the campus adjacent to the Athletic Fields, and along Eldridge Avenue south of the campus. Therefore, noise impacts would be less than those of the project, but would still be significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.
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4.5.4.12 Public Services

This alternative would not have a potential significant impact with regards to public services. Current resources would be sufficient to provide adequate coverage during construction and operation of the Athletic Fields. Less-than-significant impacts would be anticipated. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.4.13 Recreation

This alternative would not create potentially significant adverse impacts with regards to recreation. The proposed Athletic Fields would be constructed and operated. This alternative would have impacts similar to the proposed 2009 Master Plan in relation to recreation. Less-than-significant impacts are anticipated. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.4.14 Transportation and Traffic

This alternative would have the same potentially significant adverse impacts as the proposed 2009 Master Plan with regards to transportation and traffic. Impacts would be potentially significant following mitigation. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.4.15 Utilities and Service Systems

Under this alternative, there would be a slight reduction in overall demand for water, wastewater, and landfill disposal capacity compared to the proposed 2009 Master Plan. However, water demand from the Main Campus, Eldridge Avenue, and Athletic Fields development would remain the same under this alternative as for the proposed 2009 Master Plan. Student enrollment at LAMC may still occur, which would increase the generation of solid waste and water use. Comparatively, utility impacts associated with this alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed 2009 Master Plan, which would also be less than significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5 Reduced Development (No development/use of Athletic Fields Complex or Nursery Property; Remote Learning Programming and Expansion of Other Campuses in the LACCD, Continued Use of County Parks for Athletic Program)

4.5.5.1 Aesthetics

No impacts would occur since there would be no change in existing visual character at the proposed 2009 Master Plan or remote sites. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.2 Air Quality

There would be no temporary impacts from construction to the sensitive receptors on the west side of the campus adjacent to the Nursery Property. Nor would there be temporary impacts to the sensitive receptors on the east side of the campus adjacent to the Athletic Fields. GHG emissions from construction would also be minimized. There would still be exposure to long-term operational impacts to all receptors in the area. Operational impacts were estimated to be less than significant. Therefore, impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan. It is anticipated that impact would be less than significant. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.
4.5.5.3 Biological Resources

This alternative would not result in adverse impacts to the Main Campus, East Campus, Nursery Property, Eldridge Avenue, or the proposed Athletic Fields. Since the alternative would not adversely impact trees, shrubs, plants, raptors, and birds, or animals in the vicinity of the study area, no impacts would be expected. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.4 Cultural Resources

Assuming that remote learning programs would not be located in culturally sensitive locations, this alternative would not cause significant impacts to cultural resources. Since it is more likely that no direct archaeological or paleontological impacts would occur, this alternative would result in less-than-significant impacts. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.5 Energy, Conservation, and Sustainability

It is uncertain what overall impact to energy, conservation, and sustainability would result under this alternative. Energy, conservation, and sustainability gains and losses could be partially or wholly offset. Impacts would be similar to the No Athletic Fields and No Nursery Property alternatives, and would be less than significant, with the exception that since the Health, Physical Education and Fitness Center building would not meet LEED Silver criteria, operation of this facility would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.6 Geology and Soils

This alternative would have potentially adverse impacts. Deformation, ground shaking, and other seismic activities would still occur to existing structures at the Nursery Property. Effects of liquefaction, landslides, seiches, and erosion from seismic events, shallow groundwater, and potentially liquefiable loose sands would occur at the Athletics Fields site, which would not be mitigated since no revetments would be placed. Potential significant impacts would occur. Impacts would be greater than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Since operations at the Nursery Property and Athletic Fields would not occur, no impacts similar to those of the No Project Alternative would occur. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

Since no revetments would be put in place, this alternative would result in continuing water quality and hydrologic impacts to the Athletic Fields sites, similar to the No Project alternative. No impacts would occur at the Nursery Property or other sites. Less-than-significant impacts would occur. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.9 Land Use and Planning

Under this alternative, adverse impacts to land use may occur from the expansion of educational programming into the surrounding community for remote learning, specifically in regard to compatibility of use and level of development. Adverse impacts may occur with the continued use of the county parks for athletic programs, requiring students to drive off campus for field use.
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However, reduced development would involve little or no change to existing physical facilities and current conditions, and impacts to land use would be less than significant. Impacts would be greater than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.10 Mineral Resources

Since the Athletic Fields site would not be developed, and no other site involving mineral resources would be affected, no potentially adverse impact would occur. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.11 Noise

There would be no temporary construction noise impacts to the noise-sensitive land uses on the west side of the campus adjacent to the Nursery Property, nor would there be temporary construction noise impacts to the noise-sensitive land uses on the east side of the campus adjacent to the Athletic Fields. Operation of this alternative would not cause noticeable changes in noise levels. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Impacts would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.12 Public Services

This alternative would result in no significant adverse impacts with regards to public services. While services to dispersed remote facilities would not be as efficient as they would be with a single site, it is likely that existing and planned resources would be sufficient to provide adequate services during operation of these facilities. Less-than-significant impacts are anticipated. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.13 Recreation

This alternative would continue existing adverse impacts to recreation. LAMC would continue to operate in a manner similar to present conditions, but would become more congested as improvements are made. While there would be no increase in utilization of local parks, the proposed Athletic Fields sites would remain undeveloped as disturbed natural open space, and use would continue to be made of county parks and other facilities. Since this usage exists at this time, impacts would be less than significant. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.14 Transportation and Traffic

Potential adverse impacts would occur under this alternative that would be similar to the No Project Alternative. Less local development would occur, resulting in less traffic generated at the Nursery Property and Athletic Fields, but similar traffic would be added at the remote sites. The loss of parking at the Athletic Fields site under this alternative would lengthen this operational impact when compared to the proposed 2009 Master Plan. Potentially significant impacts would occur. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.5.5.15 Utilities and Service Systems

Potential adverse impacts may occur to utilities and service systems under this alternative. This alternative would result in reduction of local demand for water and wastewater services when compared to the proposed project. However, water demand from the Main Campus and East
Campus developments, plus remote campuses, would remain the same under this alternative as for the proposed 2009 Master Plan. Student enrollment growth at LAMC may still occur, which would increase the generation of and solid waste and water use. City planning efforts would continue to evaluate and assess the need to improve or upgrade its facilities, independent of the proposed 2009 Master Plan, in order to meet future demands. Comparatively, peak local utility impacts associated with this alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed 2009 Master Plan. Less-than-significant impacts are anticipated. Impacts would be the same as those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan.

4.6 Comparison of Alternative

Table 4-1 on page 4-22 compares the impacts of the alternatives evaluated in this section with those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan. Where an alternative would cause impacts that would be greater that those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan, a “−” is shown, indicating that the impacts would be more negative. Where it would cause impacts that would be less than those of the proposed 2009 Master Plan, a “+” is shown, indicating the impacts would be less negative.

4.7 Environmentally Superior Alternative

The No Athletic Fields Alternative would reduce or avoid the proposed project’s significant impact in aesthetics, biological resources, and mineral resources to less than significant or no impact. It would also have less impact than the proposed project in biological resources, cultural resources, and hazardous materials. For these reasons, this alternative is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative.
### Table 4-1 Alternatives Comparison by Issue Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Impact of Proposed Project</th>
<th>Alternative 1 No Project</th>
<th>Alternative 2 No ACOE Parcel</th>
<th>Alternative 3 No Athletic Fields Development</th>
<th>Alternative 4 No Nursery Property</th>
<th>Alternative 5 Reduced Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETICS</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>NI / +</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>NI / +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NI / +</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LTS / +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>NI / +</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>NI / +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>NI / +</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>LTS / +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY, CONSERVATION, AND SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>PS / -</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>PS / -</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>PS / -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>NI / +</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>NI / +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND USE AND PLANNING</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>PS / -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINERAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>NI / +</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>NI / +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NI / +</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LTS w/ Mitigation / +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SERVICES</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Categories:**
- NI – No Impact
- LTS – Less than Significant
- LTS w/ Mitigation – Less than Significant with Mitigation
- PS – Potentially Significant