6.0 ALTERNATIVES

As required by Section 15126.6 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, this section of the SEIR examines a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that could feasibly achieve similar objectives and reduce or eliminate the project's significant environmental effects. The analysis in this SEIR concludes that no unavoidably significant impacts would occur from implementation of the proposed project. As such, alternatives were chosen that could potentially reduce certain impacts further. The three alternatives that are analyzed include:

- *Alternative 1: No Project (2004 Master Plan would continue to apply)*
- *Alternative 2: No open space conveyance would be accepted from the County of Ventura (370-acre parcel)*
- *Alternative 3: Structured parking would be developed rather than surface parking*

These alternatives are described in greater detail and analyzed below. The alternatives evaluation examines only the seven issues analyzed in this SEIR. These issues are aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hydrology, hazards, and transportation/traffic. As required by CEQA, this section also includes a discussion of the "environmentally superior alternative" among those studied.

6.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: No Project

6.1.1 Description

This alternative assumes that the proposed 2009 Facilities Project is not adopted, and none of the facilities projects are built or implemented. Consequently, development of the CSUCI campus would proceed as provided under the 2004 Revised Master Plan, and potential environmental impacts would occur as discussed in the 2004 SEIR.

Under the no project scenario, the University would not accept a conveyance of 370-acres of open space from the County of Ventura nor would the electrical substation be completed. Additionally, all other facilities details including construction of the Potrero soccer field lights, bleacher seating, expanded flood protection levees along Long Grade Canyon Creek, and landscaped and revised access road plans would not be completed. However, it should be noted that the adoption of the No Project alternative would not preclude construction of the access road, athletic fields, and parking. These features were approved as part of the 2004 Campus Master Plan.

6.1.2 Impact Analysis

a. Aesthetics. Under this alternative, the proposed facilities would not be constructed, nor would the 370-acre open space conveyance land be accepted from the County of Ventura. Facilities identified in the 2004 Campus Master Plan Amendment SEIR would still be allowed. Visual impacts identified in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, of this document would not occur. It would eliminate viewshed modifications identified from South Lewis Road. Nighttime lighting pool sheds would not be as extensive, as athletic field lighting would not be added at the Potrero

Road soccer fields, and lighting stanchions would remain restricted to 30 feet in height. The result would be marginally reduced aesthetic effects. Therefore, the No Project alternative would be superior to the proposed project from an aesthetics perspective.

b. Air Quality. Under this alternative, some of proposed facilities (bleachers, field lighting, and new levee system) would not be constructed, nor would the open space land conveyance be accepted. This would eliminate impacts due to construction of these 2009 facilities features. All potential temporary construction-related emissions for these features would consequently not occur. Operational impacts would remain the same as analyzed in the 2004 SEIR. The result would be reduced temporary construction-related air quality impacts, and the No Project alternative would be superior in to the proposed project in this regard.

c. Biological Resources. Under this alternative, the 2009 proposed facilities would not be constructed, nor would the open space conveyance land be accepted. This would eliminate all biological impacts identified for the proposed facilities. No additional disturbance of habitat, wetlands, wildlife or plants beyond what was identified in 2004 would occur. Increased nighttime lighting associated with the proposed facilities would not occur. New mitigation identified in this SEIR would not be necessary. This alternative would not eliminate all potential impacts, as the 2004 SEIR plans for the proposed roadways and levees which still be allowed and would still impact Long Grade Canyon Creek. Since biological resource impacts would be largely similar to those identified in the 2004 SEIR, impacts in this environmental issue area under a No Project scenario are considered similar to those of the proposed project.

d. Cultural Resources. The No Project alternative may be able to avoid construction impacts to the delineated cultural resource areas (portions of the 154-acre new access road area). The 2009 proposed facilities and the open space land conveyance would not occur, but the access road and the parking lots would still be allowed. Therefore, impacts would remain substantially similar to those identified in the 2004 SEIR, and mitigation would be applicable in either scenario.

e. Hydrology. Under this alternative, the newly proposed 2009 facilities would not be constructed, nor would the open space conveyance land be accepted. However, the land use features would still be allowed under the 2004 Campus Master Plan (access road, athletic fields, and parking lots). The No Project alternative would not enable locker rooms or athletic field lighting, and therefore these features would not be exposed to flooding risk.

On the other hand, implementation of the No Project alternative would not provide construction of the levee which would reduce flooding of Long Grade Canyon Creek and provide for 10 acres of wetlands. As proposed, these are beneficial impacts and adoption of the No Project alternative would allow for the existing conditions to prevail which result in more flooding than may would occur under the proposed project. Therefore, the No Project alternative is considered inferior in the area of hydrology.

f. Hazards. Under this alternative, the 2009 proposed facilities would not be constructed, nor would the open space conveyance land be accepted. However, this would not eliminate or reduce impacts to potential health risks associated with implementation of the proposed facilities, because the access road features, athletic fields, and parking lots are allowed

under the 2004 Campus Master Plan and the hazardous materials exposures would be materials similar. The impacts related to the exposure of contaminants associated with sewage sludge and dry holes on the open space conveyance area would still occur under County ownership. Therefore, impacts would be considered similar in the area of hazards and hazardous materials.

g. Transportation. Under this alternative, the proposed facilities would not be constructed, including the new access road and open space conveyance areas. Traffic conditions would remain the same as existing and impacts would be the same as identified in the 2004 SEIR. It should be noted, the 2004 Campus Master Plan Amendment plans for the construction of the proposed access roads, and choosing this alternative would result in inconsistencies with that Plan and would temporarily delay the construction of the new access road area. Trip generation associated with the open space conveyance area would not occur.

6.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: No Open Space Conveyance

6.2.1 Description

Under this alternative, the proposed 370-acre open space conveyance from the County of Ventura to CSUCI would not occur. All other facilities identified in this SEIR would continue to be part of the proposed project as described in Section 2.0, *Project Description*. The open space conveyance area would remain under ownership of the County of Ventura and would maintain its current levels of improvement and access.

6.2.2 Impact Analysis

a. Aesthetics. The only difference between this alternative and the proposed project is that the open space conveyance area would remain under its current use and ownership. Because the open space conveyance area would be expected to be a passive recreational area under the proposed project, leaving the site in its current use would not result in a substantially different aesthetic condition. Aesthetic impacts for the remaining facilities would reflect those impacts discussed in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, of this SEIR. Mitigation measures identified in this SEIR for the proposed facilities other than the open space conveyance area would apply. Additionally, mitigation measures identified for change in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, would also apply.

b. Air Quality. The only difference between this alternative and the proposed project is that the open space conveyance area would remain under its current use and ownership. Construction impacts for the proposed projects would remain the same as analyzed in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*. Construction impacts to develop the trailhead and other minor improvements to the open space conveyance area would not require extensive grading or large structures, and thus do not constitute a significant portion of the construction impacts. Operational impacts would be incrementally lower than those analyzed in this SEIR due to the nominal reduction of trips from those using the open space conveyance area. Impacts would remain less than significant for construction and operational impacts. Therefore, the No Open Space Conveyance alternative would be similar in terms of air quality impacts to those of the proposed project.

c. Biological Resources. This alternative involves all components of the proposed project except for the conveyance of the 370 acres of County of Ventura-managed open space. The majority of the biological impacts associated with this SEIR occur within the open space conveyance area and eliminating this portion would therefore reduce impacts. However, the components associated with Long Grade Canyon Creek including the levee and the roadway overcrossing would still exhibit biological impacts. Mitigation measures proposed to reduce impacts would still apply, however, mitigation measures aimed at reducing impacts in the open space conveyance area would no longer be necessary. The slight reduction in the area of biological resource impacts resulting from not developing a trailhead facility and other features would render this alternative modestly superior from a biological resources perspective.

d. Cultural Resources. The only difference between this alternative and the proposed project is that the open space conveyance area would remain under its current use and ownership. The remaining facilities would be implemented. Impacts identified in Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources*, with respect to unknown prehistoric and archaeological resources would remain the same. Impacts would continue to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. The effects would be equivalent to those resulting from the proposed project.

e. Hydrology. This alternative would involve all components of the proposed project except for the conveyance of an additional 370 acres of open space. This area is not within the flood planes analyzed and no hydrological impacts have been identified within it. This alternative would not affect the impact discussion in Section 4.5, *Hydrology*, of this SEIR. Mitigation measures identified would also apply and impacts would be less than significant. The effects would be equivalent to those resulting from the proposed project.

f. Hazards. As indicated in Section 4.6, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, the open space conveyance area includes hazardous materials risks including pesticide contaminants, sewage sludge, and abandoned dry holes. Removal of the open space conveyance area from the project would eliminate these impacts from the project, though they would remain an ambient condition under County of Ventura ownership. Mitigation measures associated with these impacts would therefore not apply to the project, which may result in an inferior overall effect.

g. Transportation. No change in overall campus FTES (the main generator of trips to and from the campus) would occur under this alternative, though there may be a marginal increase in visitation to the open space area because of improved maintenance and management, and the formal development of a trailhead facility. That improvement would result in improved access and movement into the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreational Area for pedestrians, which is considered a beneficial impact for pedestrian circulation. Because impacts related to the proposed access roadways would remain the same, and because the additional trips to the open space parcel would be negligible, the Open Space Conveyance alternative is considered similar in transportation effects to the proposed project.

6.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: STRUCTURED PARKING

6.3.1 Description

This alternative would change the proposed parking development from two surface parking lots (west and east lots) to one structured parking garage on the west parking lot area. The proposed east parking lot would remain undeveloped, while the west parking area would support additional parking to fulfill the total planned parking spaces. Modifications to the proposed Primary Access Road would occur to support the noted alteration. The rest of the proposed facilities project would be developed as described in this SEIR. .

6.3.2 Impact Analysis

a. Aesthetics. Aesthetic impacts for the Structured Parking alternative would be greater than those for the proposed project. As indicated above, the two surface parking lots would be combined into one structured parking lot. This would result in a structure which has the potential to interrupt views of surrounding hillsides and viewsheds from multiple vantage points, including South Lewis Road and the new access road. Additionally, the parking structure would include lighting from a higher elevation which has the potential to result in increased light spillover and ambient night lighting in the proposed area. However, mitigation measure 03-AES-3(b) describing surface lot tree planting patterns would not need to be altered. Furthermore, additional mitigation measures would be required to reduce aesthetic impacts from the parking structure. The other facilities impacts would remain the same with respect to aesthetics as described in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*. The result would be that this alternative would be inferior to the proposed project from an aesthetics perspective.

b. Air Quality. As indicated above, the two surface parking lots would be combined into one structured parking lot. This would eliminate the need for the east parking lot to be graded and paved, which would reduce construction phase emissions. However, when compared to the structured parking construction, construction phase emissions would likely be greater due to increased development intensity. Construction of the parking structure would include increased building materials and coatings which have the potential to increase construction emissions. Mitigation measures would likely be required to reduce construction phase impacts associated with construction of the parking structure. Operational impacts for the proposed facilities would remain the same as FTES is not being increased or decreased. The result would be that the air quality impacts for the Structured Parking alternative would be greater than those for the proposed project.

c. Biological Resources. This alternative would site a parking structure on the west parking lot to provide enough parking spaces to allow for the east parking lot to be removed from the project. This would remove total spatial extent of impervious surface area, which could reduce the amount of runoff into Long Grade Canyon Creek and reduce biological impacts in those areas. The reduction in paved ground area would also reduce potential microclimatic changes due to heat island effects from paved surfaces which could impact biological resources. Therefore, the Structured Parking alternative could be marginally superior in the area of biological resources.

d. Cultural Resources. Implementation of the Structured Parking alternative would enable siting of the parking facilities in a way that avoids areas having prehistoric or archaeological resources. This alternative would reduce the surface area of the area to be graded by eliminating the east parking lot from construction, but would require greater excavation on the west parking lot. The result would be less ground disturbance than the proposed project. Other proposed facilities would not be impacted significantly by this alternative relative to cultural resources. The result would be that this alternative would be superior to the proposed project in the area of impacts to cultural resources.

e. Hydrology. Implementation of the Structured Parking alternative would site the parking structure on areas subject to flooding during 25-year floods. This would result in the need for mitigation to either increase the height of the parking structure to the 100-year flood zone or other height above the 25-year level as acceptable to reduce impacts. Impacts to the other proposed facilities would remain the same as discussed in Section 4.5, *Hydrology*. Impacts would be potentially significant unless mitigation is implemented, which is considered similar to the proposed project.

f. Hazards. Hazards and Hazardous Materials impacts would remain similar to those analyzed in Section 4.6, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*. The parking structure would not alter the location of area susceptible to pesticide hazards. However, this alternative would reduce the total land area to be graded by not grading the east parking lot. All impacts and mitigation measures as identified in this SEIR would continue. Despite the possibility that marginally less ground would be disturbed and therefore less spatial area would require mitigation, this hazards environmental condition and need for mitigation would remain essentially unchanged from that of the proposed project.

g. Transportation. Transportation impacts would remain similar to those analyzed in Section 4.7, *Transportation/Traffic*. Construction of the proposed access roads would be implemented, but minor design modifications would be required to provide for acceptable LOS levels for entrance into the parking structure. The parking structure would accommodate the same number of parking spaces as designed by the proposed project. Mitigation measures would likely need to be developed to accommodate the parking structure. Other proposed facilities would not be impacted significantly by this alternative relative to transportation/traffic. Therefore, the transportation impacts are similar (less than significant) as those under the proposed project.

6.4 ALTERNATIVE SITES

The proposed Facilities Projects involve various changes to the Master Plan for development of CSUCI. Implementing these changes at another location is not feasible since they relate to the development of the university at its current location. Therefore, analysis of alternative sites is not warranted.

6.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Table 6-1 provides a summary comparison of the proposed project and the two project alternatives. The table indicates both the magnitude of each impact for each alternative (Class I, II, III, or IV) and how the impact for each alternative compares to the proposed project (superior [+], similar [=], or inferior [-]).

Each of the alternatives has specific issue areas that are environmentally superior to the proposed project. However, they also contain increased impacts as compared to the proposed project. Overall, Alternative 1, No Project, is considered environmentally superior among the three options since it eliminates most of the impacts. Among the other alternatives, the No Open Space Conveyance alternative is superior in one area and inferior in another. The Structured Parking alternative is superior in three areas and inferior in three. Accordingly, the alternatives are equal overall in environmental impact, and neither the proposed project nor any alternatives would result in significant unavoidable environmental impacts.

Table 6-1 Comparison of the Environmental Impacts of Project Alternatives

Issue	Proposed Project	Alt 1 (No Project)	Alt 2 (No Open Space Conveyance)	Alt 3 (Structured Parking)
Aesthetics				
Viewsheds	II	+	=	-
Light and Glare	II	+	=	-
Preserve Open Space	III	=	=	=
Air Quality				
Construction Emissions	III	+	=	-
Biological Resources				
Sensitive Species	II	=	=	=
Sensitive Habitat	II	=	+	+
Wetlands	II	=	=	+
Wildlife Movement	II	=	=	=
Cultural Resources				
Archaeological Resources	II	=	=	+
Hydrology				
Access Road Flooding	II	-	=	=
Long Grade Canyon Creek Flooding	IV	-	=	=
Facility Flooding	II	+	=	=
Hazards				
Agricultural Contaminants	II	=	=	=
Contaminated Soils	II	=	=	=
Dry Holes	II	=	-	=
Transportation/Traffic				
LOS on Access Roads	III	=	=	=
Trip Generation for Acquisition Parcel	III	=	=	=
Total Alternatives Differential		+2	0	0

I = Unavoidably significant impact
II = Significant but mitigable impact
III = Adverse, but less than significant impact
IV = No Impact
+ Superior to the proposed project
- Inferior to the proposed project
= Similar impact to the proposed project