

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 Purpose and Scope

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an environmental impact report (EIR) include a discussion of reasonable project alternatives that would “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6[a]). As required by CEQA, this chapter identifies and evaluates potential alternatives to the proposed project.

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines explains the foundation and legal requirements for the alternatives analysis in an EIR. Key provisions are:

- “[T]he discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.” (15126.6[b])
- “The specific alternative of ‘no project’ shall also be evaluated along with its impact.” (15126.6[e][1])
- “The no project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, as well as 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. If the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘no project’ alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” (15126.6[e][2])
- “The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a ‘rule of reason’ that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.” (15126.6[f])
- “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..., 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)” (15126.6[f][1]).

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

- “Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.” (15126.6[f][2][A])
- “An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.” (15126.6[f][3])

For each development alternative, this analysis:

- Describes the alternative.
- Analyzes the impact of the alternative as compared to the proposed project.
- Identifies the impacts of the project that would be avoided or lessened by the alternative.
- Assesses whether the alternative would meet most of the basic project objectives.
- Evaluates the comparative merits of the alternative and the project.

According to Section 15126.6(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, “[i]f an alternative would cause...significant effects in addition those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.”

7.1.2 Project Objectives

As described in Section 3.2, the following objectives have been established for the proposed project and will aid decision makers in their review of the project, the project alternatives, and associated environmental impacts.

1. Replace Wedgeworth Elementary School, built as a temporary facility and now in poor condition, with a modern, educationally appropriate campus for 1,200 K-8 students.
2. Avoid the need to move students off-site during construction by maintaining the existing campus until the new campus opens.
3. Demolish the existing campus.
4. Create value by seeking rezoning of the remaining property to R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence), which would provide a maximum of 160 dwelling units.

7.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED DURING THE SCOPING/PROJECT PLANNING PROCESS

The following is a discussion of the land use alternatives considered during the scoping and planning process and the reasons why they were not selected for detailed analysis in this EIR.

7.2.1 Alternative Development Areas

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project. The key question and first

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

step in the analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6[a]). The project site is already developed as an elementary school, and the proposed project is intended to replace this existing school, built as a temporary facility, while adding value to the District's excess property. Because the proposed project's two basic objectives relate to the project location which are to replace the existing Wedgeworth ES, now in poor condition, with a modern, educationally appropriate campus, and to avoid the need to move students off-site during construction by maintaining the existing campus until the new campus opens, an alternative development alternative was not considered. Additionally, development of a 1,200-student school facility and up to 160 units in any location near the attendance boundary of the existing Wedgeworth ES would have substantially the same environmental impacts, including potentially significant impacts related to transportation. Impacts would be similar because an elementary school is typically developed in a residential community which it serves, and the site must comply with the California Department of Education's (CDE) CCR Title 5 regulations related to school facilities construction. Although site-specific impacts cannot be evaluated, project-related trips from construction of a 1,200 K-8 students capacity school and a 160-unit residential development would be similar or greater than the proposed project, because instead of an additional 600 students from the existing 600 capacity ES under the proposed project, an alternative development site would likely result in traffic impacts from relocation of the existing 600 students plus new 600 student. Trip generation from the 160-unit residential development would not change, therefore, an alternative site is unlikely to avoid or substantially lessen significant and unavoidable impact related to transportation. The proposed project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to elimination of the existing baseball fields could be avoided with an alternative development site alternative, however, it would not attain two of the basic project objectives, and three of the four alternatives selected for further analysis would avoid or reduce this significant impact associated with recreation, which would be considered a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives. Therefore, abandoning the project site and seeking an alternative location was not evaluated.

7.3 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

Based on the criteria listed above, the following four alternatives have been determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives which may avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project—in this case a transportation impact—and have the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. These alternatives are analyzed in detail in the following sections.

- No Project/Existing School Improvement Alternative
- New Expanded School Only Alternative
- New School, New Baseball Fields, and Reduced Density Residential Development Alternative
- New Replacement School and Residential Development Alternative

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative, and where the no project alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

alternative from among the others evaluated. Each alternative's environmental impacts are compared to the proposed project and determined to be environmentally superior, neutral, or inferior. Section 7.7 identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The preferred land use alternative (proposed project) is analyzed in detail in Chapter 5 of this DEIR.

7.4 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT/EXISTING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ALTERNATIVE

Under this alternative, the location of the existing Wedgeworth ES campus would not change, and no new K-8 school facilities would be constructed. However, at least 12 of the existing buildings would need to be replaced. Therefore, some demolition and construction would occur, but on a much smaller scale than the proposed project. The existing students would also need to be relocated to interim student housing during construction, requiring construction of temporary facilities on the project site, and removal of the temporary facilities once the existing buildings are replaced. No residential development would be developed, and the baseball fields would not be removed and would continue to be used by community groups.

7.4.1 Air Quality

Limited construction and operational air quality impact would occur under this alternative. The existing Wedgeworth ES campus and the baseball fields would not be demolished, and no new K-8 school facilities and residential units would be developed. Therefore, construction-related air quality impacts from these earth-moving activities and construction equipment would not occur. Demolition and construction-related emissions from the replacement buildings and interim housing would be significantly less than the proposed project due to its limited scale. Without the school expansion, the project site would not generate any increase in vehicle trips and building energy use. Therefore, the No Project/Existing School Improvement Alternative would reduce regional and localized air quality impacts during construction and operation compared to the proposed project. Air quality impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed project. However, the proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable air quality impacts.

7.4.2 Energy

The No Project/ Existing School Improvement Alternative would generate a temporary increase in energy and fuel use during construction activities. However, considering its limited size and scale compared to the proposed project, impact would be substantially less than the proposed project. And this alternative would not generate a long-term increase in fuel use and energy during project operation because there would be no increase in student enrollment capacity. Compared to the proposed project, impacts on energy would be reduced. Energy impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.4.3 Geology and Soils

Limited construction activities, including grading, would occur under the No Project/Existing School Improvement Alternative. The new construction would be limited to replacement of existing buildings and

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

placement then removal of portable interim housing buildings. Therefore, this alternative would improve the seismic safety conditions at the existing Wedgeworth ES campus for the replaced 12 buildings. This alternative would not require grading or construction activities related to the residential development, and there would be no potential for residential structures to experience seismic ground shaking, or other geologic hazards. Therefore, geologic and soils impacts would be reduced relative to the proposed project. This is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.4.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The No Project/Existing School Improvement Alternative would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions related to limited construction but without the residential development; therefore, GHG emissions would be less than the proposed project. And because the enrollment capacity would remain the same, no increase in GHG emissions during operational is anticipated. Therefore, this alternative would reduce GHG emissions compared to the proposed project. However, this is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.4.5 Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative, existing water quality conditions, groundwater supplies, drainage patterns, and runoff amounts would generally remain as is since no new residential development would occur and the replacement of the existing school buildings would occur within the same footprint. This alternative would not introduce additional impervious surfaces or new sources of water pollutants to the project area. Hydrology and water quality impacts would be less under this alternative. This is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.4.6 Noise

Under the No Project/Existing School Improvement Alternative, the existing Wedgeworth ES location and capacity would not change, and no residential development would occur. Therefore, no new long-term traffic or stationary noise onsite would be introduced. Additionally, this alternative would reduce construction-related noise impacts. Reduced short-term construction and no long-term operational noise impacts would occur with this alternative. Therefore, compared to the proposed project, noise impact would be reduced. However, no significant operational noise impacts were identified with the proposed project.

7.4.7 Recreation

No residential development would occur under this alternative, and the project site would continue to operate as an elementary school and baseball fields for the community. Therefore, potential impacts to recreation would not occur, including elimination of four baseball fields and increased demands for recreation facility for the residential development. This alternative would result in less environmental impact related to recreation compared to the proposed project. This alternative would eliminate significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project related to recreation.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.4.8 Transportation

The proposed project is anticipated to generate 2,205 total daily trips—1,137 daily trips for the additional 600 students and 1,171 trips for the 160-unit residential development minus internal trip capture of 100 trips—resulting in a total of 441 AM peak hour trips (215 inbound and 226 outbound) and 182 PM peak hour trips (101 inbound and 81 bound). Therefore, under this alternative, these trips would be eliminated. Under the existing conditions, 6 out of 16 intersections are operating at unacceptable LOS E or F: #2, Hacienda Boulevard and Colima Road; #6, Countrywood Avenue and Wedgeworth Drive; #8, Park Lawn Road and Colima Road; #13, Azusa Avenue and Pepper Brook Way; #14, Azusa Avenue and Colima Road; and #16, Fullerton Road and Colima Road. Under the proposed project, the same 6 intersections would operate at unacceptable LOS E or F, and a potentially significant impact at one intersection—#13, Azusa Avenue and Pepperbrook Way—would occur. Therefore, under this alternative, the potentially significant impact at this one intersection would be eliminated, and impacts would be less than significant. This alternative would eliminate significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project related to transportation.

7.4.9 Tribal Cultural Resources

The project site would remain in its existing conditions under the No Project/Existing School Improvement Alternative. Thus, ground-disturbing activities would be limited to the existing footings of the buildings to be replaced and interim housing locations. Therefore, impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project. However, tribal cultural resources are not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.4.10 Utilities and Service Systems

No residential development and no increase in student enrollment capacity would occur on the project site under this alternative. Therefore, there would be no increase in demand for potable water and recycled water, wastewater generation, or solid waste disposal. Overall, impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project, but would remain less than significant.

7.4.11 Conclusion

The No Project/Existing School Improvement Alternative would lessen environmental impacts in the areas of all environmental impacts addressed in this EIR—i.e., air quality, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems. Under this alternative, no significant and unavoidable transportation impact would occur. This alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project.

7.5 ALTERNATIVE 2: NEW EXPANDED SCHOOL ONLY ALTERNATIVE

Under this alternative, only Phase 1 of the proposed project would take place; therefore, no residential uses would be developed on the remaining 10 acres, and the existing two baseball fields in the remaining 10 acres would still be useable. Under this alternative, the existing Wedgeworth ES facilities would be vacated and

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

demolished once the students are moved into the new facilities and fenced in as vacant area. This alternative is intended to reduce the significant and unavoidable transportation and recreation impacts.

7.5.1 Air Quality

Under this alternative, construction and operational air quality impacts from Phase 2 development of the proposed project would be eliminated except for the demolition of the existing Wedgeworth ES. However, as shown in Table 5.1-10 in DEIR Section 5.1, *Air Quality*, the maximum daily emissions significance threshold for NO_x emissions would continue to be exceeded, and this impact would require mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts to a less than significant level. With elimination of the residential development, the potentially significant VOC emissions impact would be eliminated during the architectural-coating stage of Phase 2. Air quality impacts would be reduced during operation; however, as shown in Tables 5.1-11 and 5.1-12 in DEIR Section 5.1, *Air Quality*, no potentially significant operational air quality impacts have been identified. Overall, construction and operational air impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project; however, mitigation measures would still be required during construction, and impacts would be less than significant. Air quality is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.5.2 Energy

Under this alternative, Phase 2 development would be eliminated except for the existing Wedgeworth ES demolition; therefore, demands for 808,816 kWh/year of electricity power and 2,748,250 kBTU/year of natural gas services would not be necessary. The reduction in energy consumption is from 1,447,255 kWh/year at buildout under the proposed project to 638,439 kWh/year, a decrease of 64 percent of electricity energy, and from 3,612,475 kBTU/year to 864,225 kBTU/year at buildout, a decrease of 82 percent of natural gas energy. This alternative would result in less environmental impact related to energy compared to the proposed project. However, energy impacts were determined to be less than significant. This impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.5.3 Geology and Soils

This alternative would be required to comply with building and seismic codes and regulations, like the proposed project. However, under this alternative, less earth-moving activities would occur, and less building area would be constructed. Therefore, there would be less area to be impacted by seismic activities, including ground shaking. Geology and soil impacts of this alternative would be less than the proposed project. This is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.5.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under this alternative, the GHG emissions would decrease from 2,037 MTCO_{2e}/year at buildout to 379 MTCO_{2e}/yr, approximately 81 percent reduction, as there would be fewer vehicle trips and less building energy during operation. Construction activities associated with this alternative would also have reduced GHG emissions. Therefore, this alternative would result in a reduction in construction and operational GHG

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

emissions. Thus, impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project and would be less than significant. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.5.5 Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative, only 10 acres of the project site would be developed, and the remaining 10 acres would remain undeveloped. Therefore, potential water quality impacts during construction would be reduced. Additionally, this alternative would also result in reduced impervious area, since there would be no impervious surfaces associated with the residential units and driveways. Decreased impervious surface would result in decreased runoff volume, speed, and typical urban pollutants (oil, grease, fertilizers, etc.). However, similar to the proposed project, implementation of this alternative would require compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit requirements and implementation of various BMPs to reduce water quality impacts. Impacts to hydrology and water quality impacts of this alternative would be less than the proposed project. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.5.6 Noise

Under this alternative, only 10 acres of the proposed 20-acre site would be developed; therefore, construction noise associated with the remaining 10 acres would be eliminated. Operational noise associated with a maximum of 160 units would also be eliminated because there would not be vehicle trips, HVAC system, and other living noise associated with the residential development. Noise impacts of this alternative would be reduced compared to the project, and would be less than significant. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.5.7 Recreation

Population-inducing projects such as residential development generate demands for recreational facilities. Schools typically provide athletic facilities that could be used for recreational purpose by the general public, in terms allowed by the Civic Center Act. Elimination of residential development from the proposed project would not, therefore, create demand for recreational facilities. Under this alternative, the existing baseball fields would be useable by the community members. Impacts to recreation of this alternative would be less than the proposed project. This alternative would eliminate significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project related to recreation.

7.5.8 Transportation

Without the residential development, the daily 1,171 trips from the residential development would be removed from the traffic study area roadways, and only the additional 1,137 daily trips related to the school expansion would occur. As shown in Table 5.8-10, *2026 Plus Project Phase 2 Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service*, Phase 2 development, which includes the residential development, would result in a potentially significant impact at one of the 16 intersections evaluated (i.e., #13, Azusa Ave and Pepper Brook Way). However, as shown in Table 5.8-9, *2021 Plus Project Phase 1 Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service*, which only

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

includes the proposed Wedgeworth K-8 School, the #13 Azusa Ave and Pepper Brook Way intersection would also be potentially impacted. Therefore, although this alternative would result in less overall transportation impact, the potentially significant impact at one traffic study intersection could not be avoided. This impact is a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.5.9 Tribal Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, the area to be disturbed would be reduced from 20 acres to 10 acres. Therefore, the potential for disturbing subsurface tribal cultural resources during ground excavation would be reduced. However, even with disturbance of 10 acres for Phase 1, school development, mitigation measures would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Impacts to tribal cultural resources of this alternative would be less than the proposed project. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.5.10 Utilities and Service Systems

This alternative would generate less wastewater, consume less water, and generate less solid waste than the proposed project. Utilities and service systems impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project, and would be less than significant. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.5.11 Conclusion

The Reduced Density Alternative would lessen environmental impacts in all areas evaluated in the EIR (air quality, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems). This alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project. This alternative would eliminate the significant and unavoidable recreation impact, but the significant and unavoidable transportation impact would not be avoided.

7.6 ALTERNATIVE 3: NEW SCHOOL, NEW BASEBALL FIELDS, AND REDUCED DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

Under this alternative, the project site would be developed as the Wedgeworth K-8 School under Phase 1, and the remaining 10 acres would be developed with two baseball fields and a 90-unit residential development. Two baseball fields would be developed on an approximately four-acre area near the northwestern corner, and 90 units would be placed on an approximately six-acre area at a density of 15 units per acre. This alternative is intended to reduce significant and unavoidable transportation and recreation impacts.

7.6.1 Air Quality

Under this alternative, construction air quality impacts from Phase 2 development of the proposed project would be reduced, because the building square footage to be developed would be reduced by approximately 44 percent. As with the proposed project, the existing Wedgeworth ES would be demolished in Phase 2, and

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

two baseball fields would be developed in its place. No changes to Phase 1 air quality impacts would occur, and the maximum daily emissions significance threshold for NO_x emission would continue to be exceeded in Phase 1 development, so mitigation measures would be required to reduce air quality impacts to a less than significant level during Phase 1 development. During Phase 2, the number of units to be developed would be approximately 44 percent fewer than the proposed project, from 160 units to 90 units. However, the construction emissions threshold is evaluated in maximum daily values, and the 90 units proposed under this alternative would continue to exceed the SCAQMD regional threshold for VOC during the architectural-coating stage of this alternative. However, the number of construction days would be reduced, so overall construction air quality impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project. During operation, the number of trips related to residential units in Phase 2 would be reduced by approximately 44 percent, from approximately 1,171 daily trips to approximately 659 daily trips. Although two baseball fields would generate trips during evening hours and weekends, trips associated with the baseball fields are currently occurring and would not significantly affect the trip generation under this alternative. Overall, operational air quality impacts would be less than the proposed project. No potentially significant operational air quality impacts have been identified. Both construction and operational impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project; however, mitigation measures would still be required under construction, and impacts would be less than significant. Air quality impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.6.2 Energy

Under this alternative, Phase 2 development would be reduced to 90 units instead of 160 units; therefore, demands for 808,816 kWh/year of electricity power and 2,748,250 kBTU/year of natural gas services in Phase 2 would be reduced by approximately 44 percent. No changes to Phase 1 development would occur. Although electricity would be used for nighttime lighting at the baseball fields, electricity consumption would be minimal, and the existing baseball fields are also equipped with nighttime lighting. Therefore, this alternative would result in less environmental impact related to energy compared to the proposed project. However, energy impacts were determined to be less than significant. This impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.6.3 Geology and Soils

This alternative would be required to comply with building and seismic codes and regulations, like the proposed project. However, under this alternative, less building square footage would be constructed; therefore, the number of units and areas to be impacted by seismic activities, including ground shaking, would be reduced. Geology and soil impacts of this alternative would be less than the proposed project. This is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.6.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under this alternative, the GHG emissions related to mobile and energy sources would be reduced, because the number of trips and building energy associated with 90 units would be less than those of 160 units. No changes to the Phase 1 development would occur. Although there would be trips associated with the baseball field use, these are currently occurring at the project site, and no changes would result from project

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

implementation. Construction activities associated with this alternative would also reduce GHG emissions, as the construction size and duration would be less than the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would result in a reduction in construction and operational GHG emissions. Thus, impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.6.5 Hydrology and Water Quality

As with the proposed project, all 20 acres of the project site would be disturbed for construction. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, implementation of this alternative would require compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit requirements and implementation of various BMPs to reduce water quality impacts. However, approximately 4 acres of the project site would remain pervious turf baseball fields; therefore, there would be decreased impervious surfaces compared to the proposed project. Decreased impervious surface would result in decreased runoff volume, speed, and typical urban pollutants (oil, grease, fertilizers, etc.). Hydrology and water quality impacts during construction would be similar to the proposed project, but operational impacts are anticipated to be less than the proposed project. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.6.6 Noise

Under this alternative, duration of construction would be shortened since only 90 units would be developed instead of 160, and 4 acres would be developed as two baseball fields. Therefore, construction noise would be slightly reduced. Operational noise associated with a maximum of 90 units would also be less than with 160 units, since fewer vehicle trips and less building energy noise would be generated. Noise impacts of this alternative would be reduced compared to the project. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.6.7 Recreation

Under this alternative, demand for recreational facilities would be decreased due to reduction in number of units, and also the baseball teams would continue to be able to play at the fields. Therefore, the recreational facilities impact would be reduced compared to the proposed project. This impact is a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project, and this alternative would reduce this significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project to a less than significant level. This alternative would eliminate significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project related to recreation.

7.6.8 Transportation

Without an approximately 44 percent reduction in the number of residential units developed, the transportation impact would also be reduced under the buildout condition. However, as shown in Table 5.8-9, *2021 Plus Project Phase 1 Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service*, which only includes the proposed Wedgeworth K-8 School, intersection #13 at Azusa Ave and Pepper Brook Way would be potentially impacted, and there

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

is no feasible mitigation measure to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, even if the buildout condition traffic impact is reduced, it is anticipated that this intersection would continue to be impacted under this alternative. Although the overall transportation impact would be less than the proposed project, the potentially significant impact at one traffic study intersection could not be avoided. This impact is a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.6.9 Tribal Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, the area to be disturbed would not be reduced. Therefore, the potential for disturbing subsurface tribal cultural resources during ground excavation would be not be less than the proposed project. Impacts to tribal cultural resources of this alternative would be similar to the proposed project. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.6.10 Utilities and Service Systems

This alternative would generate less wastewater, consume less water, and generate less solid waste than the proposed project, because the number of residential units would decrease by 44 percent. Utilities and service systems impacts would be less than the proposed project. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.6.11 Conclusion

This alternative would lessen environmental impacts in the areas of all environmental impacts addressed in this EIR (i.e., air quality, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, recreation, transportation, utilities and service systems) except for the tribal cultural resources, which would have similar impacts as the proposed project. This alternative is an environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project. This alternative would eliminate significant and unavoidable recreation impact but the significant and unavoidable transportation impact would not be avoided.

7.7 ALTERNATIVE 4: NEW REPLACEMENT SCHOOL AND RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

Under this alternative, the new school would be developed with a maximum capacity of 600 students on the 10-acre portion of the project site, instead of the proposed 1,200 students, and the Phase 2 development would be developed as proposed with 160 units on the remaining 10 acres. As with the proposed project, the baseball fields would be removed. With the maximum capacity of 600 students, it is assumed that two of the classroom buildings could be one story instead of two stories, since the number of classrooms could be reduced by approximately 50 percent.

7.7.1 Air Quality

Under this alternative, construction air quality impacts from Phase 1 development of the proposed project would be reduced because the building square footage to be developed would be slightly reduced. It is

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

anticipated that one of the buildings could be eliminated or two of the two-story classroom buildings could be reduced to one story due to fewer classrooms. Assuming 27 students per class, it is anticipated that the number of necessary classrooms would decrease from 44 to 22 classrooms. Therefore, all other school-supporting facilities would also be reduced, and the overall construction air quality impacts would be less than the proposed project. However, the construction emissions threshold is evaluated in a maximum “daily” value. Since the area to be disturbed would not change and no changes to Phase 1 air quality impact would occur during site preparation, the maximum daily emissions significance threshold for NO_x would continue to be exceeded in Phase 1, and mitigation measures would be required to reduce air quality impacts to a less than significant level during Phase 1 development. No changes to air emissions during Phase 2 would occur.

During operation, this alternative would reduce daily trips associated with the school development. No changes to Phase 2 vehicle trips would occur. Therefore, overall, operational air quality impacts would be less than the proposed project. No potentially significant operational air quality impacts have been identified. Both construction and operational impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project; however, mitigation measures would still be required during construction to reduce impacts under this alternative. Air quality is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.7.2 Energy

Under this alternative, building energy demands from Phase 1 development would be reduced. Phase 1 constitutes approximately 44 percent of the proposed project’s total electricity use and approximately 24 percent of the total natural gas consumption. No changes to Phase 2 energy use would occur. This alternative would result in less environmental impact related to energy compared to the proposed project. However, energy impacts were determined to be less than significant. This impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.7.3 Geology and Soils

This alternative would be required to comply with building and seismic codes and regulations, like the proposed project. However, under this alternative, less building square footage would be constructed; therefore, the number of structures and areas to be impacted by seismic activities, including ground shaking, would be reduced. Geology and soil impacts of this alternative would be less than the proposed project. This is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.7.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under this alternative, the GHG emissions related to mobile and energy sources would be reduced, because the number of trips and building energy associated with the school development would be less than that of the proposed project. No changes to the Phase 2 development would occur. Construction activities associated with this alternative would also reduce GHG emissions, as the construction size and duration would be less than the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would result in a reduction in construction and operational GHG emissions. Thus, impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.7.5 Hydrology and Water Quality

As with the proposed project, all 20 acres of the project site would be disturbed for construction. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, implementation of this alternative would require compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit requirements and implementation of various BMPs to reduce water quality impacts. Hydrology and water quality impacts during construction would be similar to the proposed project. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.7.6 Noise

Under this alternative, duration of construction would be shortened during Phase 1 development, since only 22 classrooms and supporting facilities would be developed, instead of 44 classrooms and supporting facilities. Therefore, construction noise would be slightly reduced. Operational noise associated with a 600-student school would also be less than the proposed 1,200-student school, since less vehicle-trip and building-energy noise would be generated. Noise impacts of this alternative would be less compared to the proposed project. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.7.7 Recreation

Population-inducing projects such as residential development generate demands for recreational facilities. Schools typically provide athletic facilities that could be used for recreational purpose by the general public, in terms allowed by the Civic Center Act. Reducing the proposed student enrollment capacity to 600 from the proposed 1,200 students would not, therefore, affect the demands for recreational facilities. Under this alternative, the proposed 160 units would be developed and the existing baseball fields would be displaced. Impacts to recreation of this alternative would be similar to the proposed project. This impact is a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.7.8 Transportation

Under this alternative, a 600-student school would be constructed, the same as the existing Wedgeworth ES. Therefore, there would be no change in traffic impact in Phase 1 of the development, and the potential impact to the intersection #13 Azusa Ave and Pepper Brook Way would be eliminated in 2021. However, with up to 160 units of residential development in Phase 2, #13 intersection is anticipated to be impacted as with the proposed project. Therefore, although this alternative would result in a less overall transportation impact, the potentially significant impact at one traffic study intersection could not be avoided. This impact is a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.7.9 Tribal Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, the area to be disturbed would not be reduced. Therefore, the potential for disturbing subsurface tribal cultural resources during ground excavation would be not be less than the proposed project. Impacts to tribal cultural resources of this alternative would be similar to the proposed project. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.7.10 Utilities and Service Systems

This alternative would generate less wastewater, consume less water, and generate less solid waste than the proposed project at Phase 1 buildout, because the number of students would decrease from 1,200 to 600 students. No changes to Phase 2 development would occur. Utilities and service systems impacts would be less than the proposed project. However, this impact is not a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.7.11 Conclusion

This alternative would lessen environmental impacts in the areas of all environmental impacts addressed in this EIR (i.e., air quality, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, recreation, transportation, utilities and service systems) except for the tribal cultural resources, which would have similar impact as the proposed project.

This alternative is an environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project. However, under this alternative, the significant and unavoidable recreation and transportation impacts would not be avoided.

7.8 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires a lead agency to identify the “environmentally superior alternative” and, in cases where the “No Project” alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project, the environmentally superior development alternative must be identified. All four alternatives would reduce environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, and the No Project/Existing School Improvement Alternative has been identified as the “environmentally superior” development alternative to the proposed project. Because the “No Project” alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, a development alternative, the New Expanded School Only Alternative, is identified as the environmentally superior alternative:

- Alternative 1: No Project/Existing School Improvement Alternative
- Alternative 2: New Expanded School Only Alternative
- Alternative 3: New School, New Baseball Fields, and Reduced Density Residential Development Alternative
- Alternative 4: New Replacement School and Residential Development Alternative

“Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts” (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6[c]). Table 7-1 identifies the ability of the proposed project and each alternative to achieve project objectives, and the ability to avoid significant impact. As shown, the proposed project achieves all project objectives, but would create a significant and unavoidable transportation impact to one traffic study area intersection.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Table 7-1 Ability of Each Alternative to Meet the Project Objectives

Objective	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/Existing School Improvement Alternative	Alternative 2: New Expanded School Only Alternative	Alternative 3: New School, New Baseball Fields, and Reduced Density Residential Development Alternative	Alternative 4: New Replacement School and Residential Development Alternative
1. Replace Wedgeworth Elementary School, built as temporary facility and now in poor condition, with a modern, educationally-appropriate campus for 1,200 K-8 students.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Partially
2. Avoid the need to move students off-site during construction by maintaining the existing campus until the new campus opens.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. Demolish the existing campus.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
4. Create value by seeking rezoning of the remaining property to R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence), which would provide a maximum of 160 dwelling units.	Yes	No	No	Partially	Yes
Ability to avoid significant impact:					
▪ Recreation	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
▪ Transportation	No	Yes	No	No	No

The No Project/Existing School Improvement Alternative would not create a significant environmental impact, but none of the project objectives would be achieved under this alternative.

The New Expanded School Only Alternative would provide no residential development; therefore, it would meet three of the four project objectives. This alternative would reduce impacts related to recreation and transportation, but could not avoid a significant and unavoidable transportation impact.

The New School, New Baseball Fields, and Reduced Density Residential Development Alternative would partially meet all of the project objectives but not to the extent achievable by the proposed project. This alternative would reduce impacts related to recreation and transportation, but could not avoid a significant and unavoidable transportation impact.

The New Replacement School and Residential Development Alternative would partially meet the project objectives but not to the extent achievable by the proposed project. This alternative would reduce transportation impact but both significant and unavoidable recreation and transportation impacts would remain.