

## 5.0 ALTERNATIVES

### 5.1 PREFACE

California Public Resources Code Section 21002.1(a) requires that an EIR describe and evaluate alternatives to a proposed project, which in this case is the rehabilitation of the Fair Oaks Avenue Overhead Bridge (bridge). CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[a] sets forth more detailed guidance regarding the scope of alternatives evaluation in an EIR:

*An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the 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 effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.*

The number and range of alternatives evaluated in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason.” The CEQA Guidelines hold that an EIR must include an adequate range of alternatives such that the lead agency can make a reasoned choice. The “rule of reason” stipulates that a lead agency can take into account many factors in defining a reasonable range of alternatives:

*Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context) and whether the Proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the Proponent) (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f][1]).”*

The CEQA Guidelines further require every EIR to include consideration of a “no project alternative” in which the proposed project does not proceed.

## 5.2 SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES

Consistent with the CEQA Guidelines, pertinent case law, and good planning practice, the city selected alternatives in this EIR based on the following factors:

- The extent to which the alternative would accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project<sup>1</sup>;
- The feasibility of the alternative, taking into account site suitability, availability of infrastructure, property control (ownership), and consistency with applicable plans and regulatory limitations;
- The extent to which an alternative contributes to a “reasonable range” of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice, including the consideration of several alternatives that were rejected as infeasible;
- The requirement of the CEQA Guidelines to consider a no project alternative and to identify an environmentally superior alternative in addition to the no project alternative; and
- In a typical EIR, alternatives are evaluated based on their ability to avoid or lessen any significant and unavoidable environmental effects of the project. For this project, however, there are no such identified significant and unavoidable effects. While the project has the potential to result in several significant environmental effects (mainly related to construction activities associated with the bridge rehabilitation), this EIR sets forth feasible mitigation measures that would render all of the identified potential effects to a less-than-significant level. These effects include:
  - *Biological Resources:* Removal, trimming, and possible damage to several existing trees within the vicinity of the project. This, along with construction activities could affect special-status species potentially occupying the bridge, as well as to nesting birds through the incidental loss of eggs or nestlings.
  - *Cultural Resources:* Construction activities could inadvertently damage previously unidentified or unrecorded archaeological and paleontological resources.

---

<sup>1</sup> The project objectives are identified in **Section 3.7, Project Objectives**, of this EIR.

- *Geology/Soils*: The project site is located in an area comprised of expansive clays with moderate to high expansive potential, and on soil that could become unstable as a result of construction activities.
- *Hazards/Hazardous Materials*: Potential release of lead, asbestos, and other contaminants during construction.
- *Noise*: Construction activities would generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the general plan, temporarily increasing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.
- *Traffic/Circulation*: Construction activities could temporarily result in disruption to emergency access and bicycle/pedestrian movement through the area.

## 5.2.1 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

Based on a review of the project impacts and objectives, the City selected the following alternatives, described below in further detail.

1. No Build Alternative
2. Bridge Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of the Pedestrian Overcrossing

### Alternative 1 - No Build Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1) states that one of the alternatives analyzed in an EIR must be the “no project” alternative. Analysis of the no project alternative must discuss existing conditions in the project area, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project was not approved and development continued in accordance with existing plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

Under the No Build Alternative, none of the project features described in **Section 3.0, Project Description** would be constructed. The bridge would not be rehabilitated, the bridge deck would not be widened, no changes would be made to existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and no changes would be made to the intersections of Fair Oaks Avenue at Kifer Road and Fair Oaks Avenue. The bridge would continue to be considered “structurally deficient” and would most likely remain on FHWA’s “Eligible Bridge List” (EBL). The City recognizes that the current condition of the bridge suggests that its long-term viability may be threatened. The identified conditions of the deck in particular can be expected to continue to deteriorate unless rehabilitation moves forward. A further downgrading of the

bridge's status would be likely to result without proposed rehabilitation. Over time, this could result in further deterioration and a subsequent determination that could limit otherwise unrestricted use of the bridge.

## **Alternative 2 - Bridge Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of the Pedestrian Overcrossing**

This alternative was developed with the intent of reducing project impacts while adhering to most basic project objectives. Alternative 2 would rehabilitate the bridge, but Alternative 2 would not include the minor bridge widening that allows for a new sidewalk and widened bike lanes. Instead, Alternative 2 would entail the separate reconstruction of the pedestrian overcrossing structure (POC). If a sidewalk were not added to the bridge, reconstruction of the POC would be needed to maintain safe pedestrian access through the area. At present, the POC structure is likely too low to accommodate anticipated improvements associated with the pending electrification of Caltrain and the introduction of California High-Speed Rail (CHSR) service. In addition, the POC's access ramps are considered too steep to meet standards set forth in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Therefore, in sum, the height of the deck of the POC would need to be raised, but the grade of the access ramps to the POC deck would need to be decreased in order to accommodate pending changes to the railroad while achieving ADA compliance.

Since Alternative 2 would essentially eliminate the widening aspect of the larger bridge rehabilitation effort, Alternative 2 has the potential to lessen some of the project impacts directly related to the deck widening. However, Alternative 2 has the potential to introduce other impacts related to reconstruction of the POC.

### **5.2.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ULTIMATELY REJECTED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 sets forth several requirements regarding the consideration of alternatives in an EIR. Section 15126.6(a) and related case law hold that alternatives that are not reasonable or infeasible need not be discussed at length; alternatives that do not offer substantial environmental advantages over the project can be rejected from consideration; and alternatives that do not accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project can be excluded from detailed analysis.

Accordingly, this section briefly summarizes alternatives considered but rejected from further analysis, including the reasons for rejection.

**Deck rehabilitation with no modifications to pedestrian/bike facilities.** Given the magnitude of work involved to rehabilitate the bridge, the City concluded that improvements to pedestrian and bicycle circulation should be elements of any bridge rehabilitation work. Preservation of the “status quo” for pedestrians and bicyclists was deemed unacceptable, in particular since the existing POC does not meet requirements of the ADA. Therefore, bridge design alternatives that could not provide for long-term pedestrian and bicycle access were rejected and are not considered further in this document.

**Widening of the bridge entirely on west side.** In order for the bridge to accommodate a sidewalk and wider bike lanes, while also providing for optimum roadway geometrics, the City’s engineers concluded that the overall width of the bridge needed to increase by about 6 feet, 10 inches. The main reason this alternative was rejected is that such widening would potentially entail a partial take of a building on the adjacent Northrop Grumman property, as well as the removal of some or all of the well-established eucalyptus trees on the west side of the bridge near the intersection with Evelyn Avenue. This alternative was eliminated because of these potential effects.

**Widening of the bridge along the east and west sides.** This alternative is similar to the “western widening” alternative above with the exception that the structure widening would be balanced to occur on both the east and west sides of the structure. Balancing the widening would have the benefit of balancing the additional loads from the bridge widening to the existing structure foundations. However, proposed improvements at Hendy Avenue would still require relocation of the existing columns at Bents 7, 8, and 9 and would also still require the removal of some or all of the well-established eucalyptus trees on the west side of the bridge near the intersection with Evelyn Avenue. This alternative was eliminated due to greater environmental and community impacts and greater anticipated construction costs.

## 5.3 ANALYSIS OF SELECTED ALTERNATIVES

Throughout this section a description of each alternative is followed by a discussion of impacts and how those impacts compare to those of the project.

As permitted by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[d], the effects of the alternatives are discussed in less detail than those of the project. Notwithstanding, the alternatives analysis provides an adequate level of detail to enable the public, public agencies, and City decision-makers to understand the potential impacts of the alternatives relative to those of the project.

**Table 5-1** lists all impacts associated with the proposed project relative to the CEQA thresholds. The table notes whether the project would result in any of the following impact conclusions:

- potentially significant (PS)
- less-than-significant with mitigation (LSM),
- less-than-significant - no mitigation required (LTS)
- no impact (NI)

For this particular project, the EIR has not identified any effects that would be both significant and unavoidable (SU).

For each impact or threshold, the table provides comparative impacts for each alternative.

This section describes the impacts of each alternative compared to those identified for the proposed project in terms of whether the alternative: 1) avoids the project impact; 2) is the same as the project impact; 3) is substantially greater than the project impact; or 4) is substantially less than the project impact.

### 5.3.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 - NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Build Alternative, none of the project features described in **Section 3.0, Project Description** would be constructed. The bridge would not be rehabilitated, the bridge deck would not be widened, no changes would be made to the pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and no changes would be made to the intersections of Fair Oaks Avenue at Kifer Road and Fair Oaks Avenue at Evelyn Avenue. The No Build Alternative is considered the environmental baseline against which potential environmental effects of the action alternative (previously described) would be considered.

For these reasons, over the long-term, opting against the build alternative may result in temporary closures of the bridge and/or the portion of Hendy Avenue beneath the bridge, the imposition of load limitations, and/or intensified surficial maintenance short of the full rehabilitation contemplated in the build alternative.

The imposition, timing, and duration of such events are impossible to predict, but must be acknowledged as potential long-term outcomes of the No Build Alternative for purposes of this environmental review. Environmental impacts of the No Build Alternative, relative to the proposed project, are as follows:

### **Aesthetics**

The No Build Alternative would not result in any immediate bridge rehabilitation work. Thus, it would not result in any short-term impacts to current views, current visual character, current daytime glare, and current nighttime lighting. Additionally, no immediate tree removal would occur under the No Build Alternative. Therefore, short-term visual impacts of the No Build Alternative would be less than those of the proposed project.

However, the No Build Alternative would not include any Hendy Avenue underpass area improvements, adjacent intersection improvements, or improvements to pedestrian and bicycle mobility through this portion of Fair Oaks Avenue. These improvements would contribute to improved visual character of the built environment.

The No Build Alternative would in effect indefinitely defer maintenance of the bridge. In the long-term, this could result in unanticipated and/or unscheduled bridge closures and/or construction due to the deteriorated nature of the bridge. Such unanticipated/unscheduled activities could ultimately require some degree of unplanned tree removal. Although no short-term loss of trees would occur with the No Build Alternative, the project proposes replacement of trees in a more planned approach, which would mitigate for the short-term tree loss entailed in the project. In addition, the No Build Alternative would not include the enhanced architectural features of the project that contribute to beneficial visual effects. Therefore, long-term adverse aesthetic effects of the No Build Alternative could be greater than those of the Build Alternative.

### **Agriculture and Forestry Resources**

Neither the project nor the No Build Alternative would result in any impact to these resources, as such resource areas/land uses do not exist in the highly urbanized Fair Oaks bridge area.

**Air Quality**

No bridge rehabilitation work would occur with the No Build Alternative. As a result, none of the short-term construction-related emissions resulting from the anticipated rehabilitation would occur. Mitigation measures are identified in this EIR that would reduce the potential air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level. The No Build Alternative would eliminate the need for implementation of mitigation to offset such impacts. Therefore, short-term air quality impacts of the No Build Alternative would be less than those of the proposed project.

The No Build Alternative would in effect indefinitely defer maintenance of the bridge. In the long-term, this could result in unanticipated and/or unscheduled bridge closures and/or construction due to the deteriorated nature of the bridge. Such unanticipated/unscheduled activities could individually or collectively result in air pollutant emissions. Therefore, long-term air quality impacts could be equal to or greater than those of the project.

**Biological Resources**

The No Build Alternative would have no short-term impact to biological resources as no rehabilitation work would immediately occur and thus no trees would be removed. Mitigation measures are identified in this EIR that would reduce potential impacts to nesting species and any roosting bats that might inhabit the bridge and adjacent trees to a less-than-significant level. In the short-term, the No Build Alternative would eliminate the need for implementation of mitigation measures to offset impacts to biological resources and would not contribute to cumulative impacts to biological resources. Therefore, short-term impacts of the No Build Alternative would be less than the proposed project.

The No Build Alternative would in effect indefinitely defer maintenance of the bridge. In the long-term, this could result in unanticipated and/or unscheduled bridge closures and/or construction due to the deteriorated nature of the bridge. Such unanticipated/unscheduled activities could ultimately require some degree of unplanned tree removal and/or disturb nesting species or roosting bats. Although the short-term loss of trees would not occur with the No Build Alternative, the project proposes replacement of trees and mitigation to reduce potential impacts to nesting species in a more planned approach, which would mitigate for the short-term tree loss and potential species disturbance entailed in the project. Therefore, long-term impacts to biological resources could be equal to or greater than those of the proposed project.

### **Cultural Resources**

There are no known cultural resources on the project site. The potential degradation or loss of unknown archaeological and paleontological resources would not occur with the No Build Alternative as no ground disturbance would occur in the short-term. Short-term impacts of the No Build Alternative would be less than the proposed project since it would not result in any adverse effect to any existing (unknown) cultural resources or those that might be uncovered during planned construction.

The No Build Alternative would in effect indefinitely defer maintenance of the bridge. In the long-term, this could result in unanticipated and/or unscheduled bridge closures and/or construction due to the deteriorated nature of the bridge. Such unanticipated/unscheduled activities have the potential to require similar levels of ground disturbance as the Build Alternative and thus similar or greater potential to result in effects to previously undiscovered cultural resources. Therefore, long-term impacts to cultural resources could be equal to or perhaps greater than those of the proposed project.

### **Geology and Soils**

The No Build Alternative would not include the planned rehabilitation work associated with the project. Therefore, in the short-term, none of the impacts related to geology and soils associated with project construction would occur. Mitigation measures are identified in this EIR that would reduce potential geologic and soil impacts to a less-than-significant level. The No Build Alternative would eliminate the immediate need for implementation of such mitigation measures to offset these impacts. Short-term impacts of the No Build Alternative would thus be less than the proposed project.

The No Build Alternative would in effect indefinitely defer maintenance of the bridge. In the long-term, this could result in unanticipated and/or unscheduled bridge closures and/or construction due to the deteriorated nature of the bridge. Such unanticipated/unscheduled activities have the potential to require similar levels of ground disturbance as the Build Alternative. Furthermore, under the No Build Alternative, the bridge would not undergo seismic retrofitting or any of the improvements intended to increase overall safety and long-term viability of the bridge. Therefore, long-term impacts related to geology and soils resulting from the No Build Alternative could be equal to or perhaps greater than those of the proposed project.

**Greenhouse Gases (GHGs) and Energy**

No bridge rehabilitation work would occur under the No Build Alternative, and none of the short-term greenhouse gas/energy impacts associated with construction activities would occur. Therefore, short-term impacts of the No Build Alternative would be less than the proposed project.

The No Build Alternative would in effect indefinitely defer maintenance of the bridge. In the long-term, this could result in unanticipated and/or unscheduled bridge closures and/or construction due to the deteriorated nature of the bridge. Such unanticipated/unscheduled activities could individually or collectively result in GHG emissions and energy usage. Therefore, long-term GHG and energy-related impacts could be equal or greater than those under the proposed project.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Under the No Build Alternative, the existing bridge would not be rehabilitated and no construction activities would occur. This EIR includes mitigation measures which would reduce the impacts from the release of dust and asbestos due to excavation and other ground disturbing activities to a less-than-significant level. The No Build Alternative would eliminate the need for such mitigation measures. Thus, short-term impacts of the No Build Alternative would be less than the proposed project.

The No Build Alternative would in effect indefinitely defer maintenance of the bridge. In the long-term, this could result in unanticipated and/or unscheduled bridge closures and/or construction due to the deteriorated nature of the bridge. Such unanticipated/unscheduled activities have the potential to require similar levels of ground disturbance as the Build Alternative and thus similar or potential to result in the release of hazardous materials. Therefore, long-term impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials could be equal to those under the proposed project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

Implementation of the No Build Alternative would result in no alteration to the width of the bridge or to the current drainage patterns on the site. Existing rates of offsite flow and catchment would continue. Therefore, hydrology and water quality impacts of the No Build Alternative would be less than those of the proposed project.

### **Land Use and Planning**

The No Build Alternative would result in a continuation of the existing uses on site. The No Build Alternative is considered similar in effect to the proposed project as both uses are consistent with existing General Plan and zoning designations. The proposed project would help reduce an existing physical division in the community by substantially improving pedestrian access from Kifer Road to Evelyn Avenue. The No Build Alternative would not make any change to the existing physical division. Therefore, land use and planning impacts of the No Build Alternative would be greater than those of the proposed project.

### **Mineral Resources**

As the project site contains no known mineral resources, neither the project nor the No Build Alternative would result in any impacts to such resources.

### **Noise**

#### *Short-term Construction Noise Impacts*

There would be no short-term construction-related noise impacts, because no construction would occur at the project site under the No Build Alternative. Mitigation is provided in this EIR that reduces all such impacts to a less-than-significant level. The No Build Alternative would eliminate the need for implementation of such mitigation to offset these impacts. Therefore, short-term noise related impacts of the No Build Alternative would be less than the proposed project.

#### *Long-term Noise Impacts*

The No Build Alternative would result in a continuation of existing uses on the project site. The continuation of existing uses is considered similar between the proposed project and the No Build Alternative. There would be no significant operational noise impacts associated with either the proposed project or the No Build Alternative since both uses would result in long-term operational noise levels that would be within the thresholds set forth in the City's Noise Regulations of the Municipal Code and General Plan Noise Element policies.

The No Build Alternative would in effect indefinitely defer maintenance of the bridge. In the long-term, this could result in unanticipated and/or unscheduled bridge closures and/or construction due to the deteriorated nature of the bridge. Such unanticipated/unscheduled activities could ultimately result in noise impacts. Therefore, long-term noise impacts of the No Build Alternative could be equal to or greater than those of the proposed project.

**Population and Housing**

No bridge rehabilitation work would occur under the No Build Alternative, and the proposed project does not include the construction or displacement of any homes. Population and Housing impacts would be equal and at less-than-significant levels for both the proposed project and the No Build Alternative.

**Public Services and Recreation**

The No Build Alternative would result in a continuation of existing uses on the project site. The continuation of existing uses is considered similar between the proposed project and the No Build Alternative, since both uses would result in continued use of the bridge. Neither the Build Alternative nor the proposed project would result in the need to physically expand public services since they would not increase population or otherwise cause an increase in demand for any public service. Impacts of the No Build Alternative would therefore be considered equal to the proposed project with respect to public services and recreation.

**Traffic and Circulation***Short-term Construction Traffic Impacts*

There would be no short-term construction-related traffic impacts resulting from the No Build Alternative, because project-related bridge rehabilitation work would not occur. Mitigation is provided in this EIR that reduces all such impacts to a less-than-significant level. The No Build Alternative would eliminate the short-term need for implementation of such mitigation to offset these impacts. Therefore, short-term traffic and circulation impacts of the No Build Alternative would be less than those of the project.

*Long-term Traffic Impacts*

The No Build Alternative would result in the continuation of existing uses on the site and would not result in a widened bridge deck, improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and intersection improvements. The level of service on all area roadways is acceptable under current conditions and would remain so under both the No Build Alternative and the proposed project. The No Build Alternative would in effect indefinitely defer maintenance of the bridge. In the long-term, this could result in unanticipated and/or unscheduled bridge closures and/or construction due to the deteriorated nature of the bridge. Such unanticipated/unscheduled activities could ultimately result in traffic and circulation impacts. Therefore, long-term traffic impacts of the No Build Alternative could be equal to or greater than those of the proposed project.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

The No Build Alternative would result in the continuation of existing uses on the project site, and no construction activity would occur that could potentially impact utilities and service systems. Therefore, short-term impacts of the No Build Alternative would be less than those of the proposed project.

The No Build Alternative would in effect indefinitely defer maintenance of the bridge. In the long-term, this could result in unanticipated and/or unscheduled bridge closures and/or construction due to the deteriorated nature of the bridge. Such unanticipated/unscheduled activities could ultimately require emergency repair work resulting in impacts to utilities and service systems. Therefore, long-term impacts of the No Build Alternative could be greater than or equal to the proposed project.

## **5.3.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 - RECONSTRUCTION OF PEDESTRIAN OVERCROSSING**

Alternative 2 would rehabilitate the bridge, but would not include the minor bridge widening that would allow for a new sidewalk and widened bike lanes to be located on the bridge deck.

Instead, Alternative 2 would entail the separate reconstruction of the separate, free-standing POC. At present, the POC structure is too low to accommodate anticipated improvements associated with the electrification of Caltrain and the introduction of CHSR service. The new stand-alone POC would parallel the existing overhead structure providing pedestrian access full length between Evelyn Avenue and Kifer Road. The new POC would need to be raised above its current elevation by up to 5 feet in order to accommodate future Caltrain electrification and High Speed Rail. The POC's pedestrian access ramps currently do not meet standards set forth in the ADA. As such, the grade of the ramps would need to be reduced to achieve ADA compliance. Improvements to the existing overhead structure would be limited to repairs and barrier and electrolier replacement only.

Since Alternative 2 would essentially eliminate the widening of the bridge, Alternative 2 has the potential to lessen some of the project impacts directly related to the deck widening. However, reconstruction of the POC in its entirety would entail extensive and complex construction activities, particularly given its vicinity over an active railroad. Demolition and reconstruction of the POC may result in more severe construction-related impacts related to air quality, noise, GHGs and energy; however, it may reduce other construction-related impacts such as tree removal.

The potential environmental impacts that may result from implementation of Alternative 2 relative to the proposed project are as follows:

### **Aesthetics**

Under Alternative 2, the POC would be reconstructed to continue to accommodate pedestrian access. Short-term construction-related tree removal would be reduced under Alternative 2, thus visual impacts in the short-term would be less than the proposed project. However, visually, the POC has a strong and somewhat negative visual character. The chain link fencing on the deck in particular lends a cage-like feel that somewhat degrades the visual character in the area. Reconstruction of the POC could potentially improve its appearance. Furthermore, improvements would be limited to pedestrian access, and would not improve bicycle infrastructure and mobility. These improvements would contribute to overall improved visual character of the built environment. Therefore, long-term aesthetic impacts of the proposed project and Alternative 2 would be similar.

### **Agriculture and Forestry Resources**

Neither the proposed project nor Alternative 2 would result in any impacts to agriculture and forestry resources, as such resource areas/land uses do not exist in the highly urbanized Fair Oaks bridge area.

### **Air Quality**

Under Alternative 2, short-term construction activities would be greater than the proposed project due to the demolition and reconstruction of the POC. Thus short-term construction-related air quality impacts would be greater under Alternative 2 than the proposed project. Mitigation measures are identified in this EIR that would reduce potential air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 2 would also require the need for implementation of such mitigation to offset these impacts. Long-term use of the bridge and associated emissions affecting air quality would be similar under both alternatives. Therefore, long-term impacts to air quality would be equal under Alternative 2 and the proposed project.

### **Biological Resources**

Alternative 2 would affect biological resources in the same manner as the proposed project as short-term construction activities could disturb roosting bats that are potentially occupying the bridge, as well as to nesting birds through the incidental loss of eggs or nestlings. However, no bridge widening would occur under this Alternative; therefore, tree removal would no longer be required. Therefore, short-term impacts of Alternative 2 would be less than the proposed project with respect

to biological resources. However, long-term use of the bridge would be similar under both alternatives. Therefore, long-term impacts to biological resources would be equal under Alternative 2 and the proposed project.

### **Cultural Resources**

There are no known cultural resources on the project site. The potential degradation or loss of unknown archaeological and paleontological resources would increase under Alternative 2 as increased construction-related ground disturbance would occur in the short-term to reconstruct the POC. Short-term impacts to cultural resources resulting from Alternative 2 would thus be greater than the proposed project. Over the long-term, however, the potential degradation or loss of unknown archaeological and paleontological resources would be unlikely under both alternatives as little ground disturbance would occur. Therefore, long-term impacts to cultural resources from Alternative 2 would be equal to the proposed project.

### **Geology and Soils**

Under Alternative 2, reconstruction of the POC would require more extensive construction activities than the proposed project. Therefore, the short-term geologic/soils impacts associated with construction activities would be greater than the proposed project. Mitigation measures are identified in this EIR that would reduce potential geology and soils impacts to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 2 would also require the need for implementation of such mitigation to offset these impacts. In the long-term, however, Alternative 2 would function similarly to the proposed project as both would undergo seismic retrofitting resulting in improved safety for motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians. Therefore, long-term impacts of Alternative 2 related to geology and soils would be equal to the proposed project.

### **GHGs and Energy**

Under Alternative 2, reconstruction of the POC would require increased construction activities, resulting in greater short-term GHG emissions and energy usage than the proposed project. Therefore, short-term impacts related to GHGs and energy would be greater under Alternative 2 than the proposed project. Alternative 2 may require the need for implementation of such mitigation to offset these impacts. Over the long-term, however, bridge usage and resulting GHG emissions and energy use would be similar between Alternative 2 and the proposed project. Therefore, long-term impacts of Alternative 2 would be equal to the proposed project.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Under Alternative 2, reconstruction of the POC would require increased construction activities, resulting in greater risks associated with hazards and hazardous material release than the proposed project. Therefore, short-term impacts related to hazardous materials would be greater under Alternative 2 than the proposed project. Mitigation measures are identified in this EIR that would reduce potential hazardous material impacts to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 2 would also require the need for implementation of such mitigation to offset these impacts. Over the long-term, however, bridge operations would be similar between Alternative 2 and the proposed project. Therefore, long-term impacts of Alternative 2 would be equal to the proposed project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

Hydrology and water quality impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar in effect to the proposed project. Neither alternative would generate wastewater, interfere with groundwater resources, or alter drainage patterns significantly. Therefore, the short- and long-term impacts of Alternative 2 to hydrology and water quality would be equal to the proposed project.

**Land Use and Planning**

Alternative 2 is considered similar in effect to the proposed project as both uses are consistent with existing General Plan and zoning designations. Both the proposed project and Alternative 2 would help reduce an existing physical division in the community by substantially improving pedestrian access from Kifer Road to Evelyn Avenue. Both short- and long-term impacts of Alternative 2 would be equal to the proposed project.

**Mineral Resources**

As the project site contains no known mineral resources, neither the proposed project nor Alternative 2 would result in any impacts to such resources. Therefore, impacts to mineral resources resulting from Alternative 2 would be equal to the proposed project.

**Noise**

Under Alternative 2, reconstruction of the POC would require increased construction activities, resulting in greater noise impacts than the proposed project. Therefore, short-term impacts related to noise would be greater under Alternative 2 than the proposed project. Mitigation measures are identified in this EIR that would reduce potential noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 2 would also require the need for implementation of such mitigation to offset these impacts.

Over the long-term, however, bridge operations would be similar between Alternative 2 and the proposed project. Therefore, long-term impacts of Alternative 2 related to noise would be equal to the proposed project.

#### **Population and Housing**

Neither the proposed project nor Alternative 2 include the construction of new homes, or require the displacement of people or housing, and would not result in any impacts to such resources. Therefore, impacts related to population and housing under Alternative 2 would be equal to the proposed project.

#### **Public Services and Recreation**

Both the proposed project and Alternative 2 would not increase population or otherwise cause an increase in demand for any public service. There are no expected direct or indirect effects on service ratios, response times, or any other performances objectives for fire protection, police protection, school, parks, or any other public facilities. Therefore, impacts of Alternative 2 to public services and recreation would be equal to the proposed project.

#### **Traffic and Circulation**

Under Alternative 2, reconstruction of the POC would require increased construction activities, and would not accommodate pedestrian access throughout the construction period. Thus, short-term impacts to traffic and circulation would be greater under Alternative 2 than the proposed project. Mitigation measures are identified in this EIR that would reduce potential traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 2 would also require the need for implementation of such mitigation to offset these impacts. Over the long-term, however, bridge operations would be similar between Alternative 2 and the proposed project. The level of service on all roadways in the project area is acceptable under current conditions and would remain so under both Alternative 2 and the proposed project. Therefore, long-term impacts of Alternative 2 related to traffic and circulation would be equal to the proposed project.

#### **Utilities and Service Systems**

Under Alternative 2, reconstruction of the POC would require increased construction activities, which may have greater impacts to utilities and service systems in the project area. Thus, short-term impacts related to utilities would be greater under Alternative 2 than the proposed project. Alternative 2 would not alter the width of the existing bridge; therefore, there would be no increase in stormwater flow from the bridge deck. Therefore, long-term impacts of Alternative 2 related to utilities and service systems would be less than the proposed project.

## 5.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires the identification of the Environmentally Superior Alternative among the alternatives to the project. The Environmentally Superior Alternative is the alternative that would avoid or substantially lessen, to the greatest extent, the environmental impacts associated with the project. Additionally, if the No Build alternative is determined to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative, CEQA requires that the EIR identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)).

The identification of the Environmentally Superior Alternative results from a comparison of the impacts associated with each alternative, as summarized in **Table 5-1**. Based on a thorough comparison of the two Alternatives, the **proposed project** is considered the environmentally superior alternative because it would enhance the overall safety of the bridge, thus avoiding potentially detrimental long-term impacts that may occur as a result of indefinitely delaying the project's proposed bridge rehabilitation work.

Moreover, as described herein, the overall level of construction activity would be lower for the proposed project relative to Alternative 2. The replacement of the POC would likely entail a substantial construction effort that would extend the duration and geography of intensive construction work relative to the proposed project. Alternative 2 would therefore have similar or greater construction-related impacts associated with air quality, GHG emissions, hazardous materials, and geology and soils. The proposed project would also reduce the severity of other project impacts in several other environmental topic areas, as demonstrated in **Table 5-1**.

Table 5-1 Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives

Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives						
Impact	Proposed Project		Alternative 1: No Build Alternative		Alternative 2	
	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term
<b>Aesthetics</b>						
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings?	LTS	NI	NI	PS↑	LTS=	LTS=
Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Air Quality</b>						
Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	LTS	LTS	NI	PS	PS	LTS =

Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives						
Impact	Proposed Project		Alternative 1: No Build Alternative		Alternative 2	
	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term
Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	LTS	NI	NI	PS	PS	NI
Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	LSM	LTS	NI	PS	PS	LTS=
Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Biological Resources</b>						
Would the project Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to: marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI

Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives						
Impact	Proposed Project		Alternative 1: No Build Alternative		Alternative 2	
	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term
Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, Regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	LSM	NI	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LSM↓	NI
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	LSM	NI	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LSM=	NI
Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with an established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Cultural Resources</b>						
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	LSM	NI	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LSM↑	NI

Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives						
Impact	Proposed Project		Alternative 1: No Build Alternative		Alternative 2	
	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	LSM	NI	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LSM↑	NI
Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	LSM	NI	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LSM↑	NI
Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	LSM	NI	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LSM↑	NI
<b>Geology and Soils</b>						
Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:		--		--		--
1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	LTS	LTS	LTS↑	PS (= or ↑)	LTS↑	LTS=
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	LTS	LTS	LTS↑	PS (= or ↑)	LTS↑	LTS=
4. Landslides?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI

<b>Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives</b>						
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>		<b>Alternative 1: No Build Alternative</b>		<b>Alternative 2</b>	
	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>
Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	LTS	NI	NI	NI	LTS↑	NI
Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	LSM	LTS	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LSM=	LTS=
Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	LSM	LTS	LTS	PS (= or ↑)	LSM=	LTS=
Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy</b>						
Would the project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS=	PS	LTS=
Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI

Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives						
Impact	Proposed Project		Alternative 1: No Build Alternative		Alternative 2	
	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term
<b><i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i></b>						
Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials	LTS	LTS	LTS↓	LTS=	LTS↑	LTS=
Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment	LSM	LTS	NI	PS=	LSM↑	LTS=
Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI

Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives						
Impact	Proposed Project		Alternative 1: No Build Alternative		Alternative 2	
	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term
For a project in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urban areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Noise</b>						
Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	LSM	LTS	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LSM↑	LTS=
Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	LTS	LTS	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LTS↑	LTS=
Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	LTS	NI	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LTS↑	NI
Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	LSM	NI	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LSM↑	NI

Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives						
Impact	Proposed Project		Alternative 1: No Build Alternative		Alternative 2	
	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term
For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Traffic and Circulation</b>						
Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	LTS	LTS	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LTS↑	LTS=
Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	LTS	LTS	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LTS↑	LTS=

<b>Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives</b>						
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>		<b>Alternative 1: No Build Alternative</b>		<b>Alternative 2</b>	
	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>
Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	LSM	LTS	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LSM↑	LTS=
Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance of safety of such facilities?	LSM	LTS	NI	PS (= or ↑)	LSM↑	LTS=
<b><i>Utilities and Service Systems</i></b>						
Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	LTS	LTS	NI	PS(= or ↑)	LTS↑	NI

<b>Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives</b>						
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>		<b>Alternative 1: No Build Alternative</b>		<b>Alternative 2</b>	
	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>
Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b><i>Agriculture and Forestry Resources</i></b>						
Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI

<b>Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives</b>						
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>		<b>Alternative 1: No Build Alternative</b>		<b>Alternative 2</b>	
	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>
Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b><i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i></b>						
Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI

Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives						
Impact	Proposed Project		Alternative 1: No Build Alternative		Alternative 2	
	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term
Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	LTS	LTS	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flows?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI

<b>Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives</b>						
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>		<b>Alternative 1: No Build Alternative</b>		<b>Alternative 2</b>	
	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>	<b>Short-term</b>	<b>Long-term</b>
Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Land Use and Planning</b>						
Would the project physically divide an established community?	NI	NI	NI	PS↑	NI	NI
Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the General Plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Mineral Resources</b>						
Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI

Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives						
Impact	Proposed Project		Alternative 1: No Build Alternative		Alternative 2	
	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term
Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Population and Housing</b>						
Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project displace a substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Public Services and Recreation</b>						
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:		--		--		--
1. Fire protection?	NI	NI=	NI	NI	NI	NI

Summary Comparison of Impacts: Project and Alternatives						
Impact	Proposed Project		Alternative 1: No Build Alternative		Alternative 2	
	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term
2. Police protection?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
3. Schools?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
4. Parks?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
5. Other public facilities?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI

Notes: LTS: less than significant; LSM: less than significant after mitigation; SU: significant and unavoidable; NI: no impact; ↓: lesser; ↑: greater; =: similar  
Source: Circlepoint, 2014.

*Page Intentionally Left Blank*