

## **CHAPTER 6 ALTERNATIVES**

---

### **6.1 INTRODUCTION**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) “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 significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (14 CCR 15126(a)). The CEQA Guidelines direct that the selection of alternatives be governed by “a rule of reason.” The alternatives selected for detailed review in the EIR may be limited to those that “would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the project” and would “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project.” The selection of alternatives and their discussion must “foster informed decision making and public participation” (14 CCR 15126 (a)). This chapter identifies potential alternatives to the proposed project and evaluates them, as required by CEQA.

#### **6.1.1 Project Objectives**

The overall goal of the Facilities Master Plan (proposed project) is to provide the optimal physical settings to support the North Orange County Community College District’s (District’s) academic mission. The intent of the proposed project is to develop modern teaching and learning facilities that would attract students to Cypress College while providing the physical resources necessary to support the educational process. With this goal in mind, project objectives were developed during the proposed project planning process. The proposed project’s objectives include goals to:

- Update and modernize existing building space to meet the District’s instructional needs.
- Construct new buildings to meet current and future instructional needs and the District’s academic mission.
- Accommodate growth in the student body over the planning horizon.
- Expand veterans’ facilities and services to train and retrain veterans as they transition into the civilian workforce.
- Implement health and safety repairs, energy-efficient enhancements, water conservation, American with Disabilities Act (ADA) access, building security, National Fire Protection Associations Life Safety Code requirement upgrades, mass communication system, lock-down capabilities, and other needed facility renovations.

## **6.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND ELIMINATED DURING THE SCOPING/PROJECT PLANNING PROCESS**

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

### **6.2.1 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 of the significant effects of the project. The key question and first 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 avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR (14 CCR 15126(f)(2)). Since the proposed project is a Facilities Master Plan update, an alternative site analysis is not appropriate. The site of the proposed project is Cypress College; moving the Facilities Master Plan update to another campus or off site would not meet the project objectives and would not be feasible. As a result, alternative development areas were rejected and are not analyzed in detail in this Program EIR.

## **6.3 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS**

The Preservation Alternative, in addition to the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative and No Project/No Development Alternative, was selected to represent a reasonable range of alternatives that have the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project but may avoid or substantially lessen significant effects of the proposed project.

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 an alternative from among the others evaluated as environmentally superior. Each alternative’s environmental impacts are compared to the proposed project and determined to be environmentally superior, neutral, or inferior. However, only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are used in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project. Environmental impacts involving historic resources were found to be significant and unavoidable. Section 6.4 identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

### **6.3.1 No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative**

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate and analyze the impacts of the “No Project” Alternative. When the project is the revision of an existing land use

or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the “No Project” Alternative will be the continuation of the plan, policy, or operation into the future. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative, as required by the CEQA Guidelines, analyzes the effects of continued implementation of the District’s existing 1999 Master Plan. This means that the campus would be built out according to the growth projections at that time, which would likely not accommodate the projected growth expected through 2025. It also would not provide the modernization of facilities needed to meet today’s needs. These are the projects that remain to be built out under the 1999 Master Plan:

- Piazza Renovation – Removal of portions of concrete rails and sections of the Piazza
- Administration third and fourth floor interior renovations
- Humanities swing space (paint and carpet)
- Student Center new building
- Gateway quad landscape
- Swing space for Business Education
- Swing space for Gym 2
- Swing space modularity.

### **Aesthetics**

Under the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative, the campus would continue to function under the direction of the existing Master Plan, which is almost built out. There would likely need to be a greater effort made to integrate new building design with the existing buildings’ design. Buildout of the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative could be done in such a way to be aesthetically pleasing, but it would not include proposed project elements, such as the removal of the exterior concrete stairwells to allow more light into the buildings, removal of tiles to improve maintenance and replacement costs, and updating the look of the buildings’ exteriors. It would also not include construction of new academic buildings, such as the Science, Engineering, and Mathematics (SEM) building or Veteran’s Resource Center/Student Activities Center addition, which would be designed to complement the existing campus. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is environmentally inferior to the proposed project.

### **Air Quality**

Under the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative, the campus would continue to function under the direction of the existing Master Plan, which is almost built out. Buildout under the existing Master Plan would not include large projects, like the new SEM building, Veterans’ Resource Center/Student Activities Center addition, Library and Learning Resource Center

addition, and the parking structure. Less construction would mean that there would be fewer construction-related and operational air quality impacts, and the lack of new buildings would mean that proposed programs would not be served, potentially capping student enrollment. From an environmental standpoint, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project in terms of air quality impacts.

### **Cultural Resources**

The 1999 Master Plan envisioned the removal of portions of the piazza and renovations to the original 1960s and 1970s Brutalist-style buildings. These renovations would involve the removal of character-defining features in the contributors to the Cypress College Historic District. As a result, there would be historic resources impacts similar to the proposed project. Archaeological and paleontological resources impacts would be mitigated under both the existing Master Plan and the proposed project. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project, because both would have significant impacts to historic resources, and impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources would be mitigated.

### **Geology and Soils**

Under the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative, the campus would continue to function under the direction of the existing Master Plan. Because construction activity would be reduced under the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative, and fewer students would be anticipated under the existing Master Plan, fewer people would be exposed to geology and soils impacts, including earthquakes, ground shaking, liquefaction, and impacts associated with expansive soils. However, under both the 1999 Master Plan and the proposed project, geology and soils impacts are considered less than significant with adherence to existing regulations. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative would be considered environmentally neutral to the proposed project with regard to geology and soils.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Under the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative, the campus would continue to function under the direction of the existing Master Plan, which is almost built out. Buildout under the existing Master Plan would not include large projects, like the new SEM building, Veterans' Resource Center/Student Activities Center addition, Library and Learning Resource Center addition, and the parking structure. Less construction would mean that there would be less construction-related greenhouse gas emissions, and the lack of new buildings would mean that proposed programs would not be served, potentially capping student enrollment, which would result in fewer operational greenhouse gas emissions. While the proposed project does not have significant greenhouse gas emissions impacts, there would be greater construction and

operational impacts under the proposed project than the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project in terms of greenhouse gas emissions.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

An Environmental Data Resources search returned two listings at the project site in the Leaking Underground Storage Tank database. A review of data from the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker site and the Orange County Department of Environmental Health records indicate that these two listings are for the same release case. Records for this case indicate a release of waste oil to soil; the case was closed in October 1992. However, under the proposed project, impacted soils could be encountered during demolition and construction. Furthermore, due to the age of buildings planned for renovation and demolition, contaminated materials and hazardous substances, like lead-based paint or asbestos, could be released. These impacts are very similar to the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative because that Facilities Master Plan also envisioned renovation of buildings. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is neutral compared to the proposed project in terms of hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

The 1999 Master Plan and the proposed project both have hydrology and water quality impacts that can be mitigated. These impacts were primarily related to the potential for water quality impacts during construction and operation. The amount of pervious and impervious surfaces will be similar under the proposed project and the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative, thus operational impacts related to hydrology and water quality are expected to be the same. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of hydrology and water quality impacts.

### **Land Use**

The 1999 Master Plan and the proposed project would promote consistency with relevant goals and policies of the City of Cypress General Plan and zoning code. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of land use impacts.

### **Noise**

The 1999 Master Plan and the proposed project both have noise impacts that can be mitigated. These impacts were primarily related to the potential for noise impacts during construction and

renovation. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of noise impacts.

### **Public Services**

Under the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative, the campus would continue to operate under the direction of the existing Master Plan. The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative would not generate additional calls for service. Under the proposed project, there would be additional demand for fire and police services related to projected campus growth; however, the increase in annual projected calls would be minor and there would be no need for new or physically altered emergency response support facilities. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of public services impacts.

### **Traffic and Circulation**

Under the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative, the campus would continue to operate under the direction of the existing Master Plan. The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative would not generate additional trips and there are no traffic impacts under the proposed project. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of traffic impacts.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

Under the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative, the campus would continue to operate under the direction of the existing Master Plan. Under the proposed project, there would be a need for additional water, wastewater, and landfill services related to projected campus growth. The proposed project would require mitigation to ensure existing infrastructure has the capacity to serve the proposed project and coordination with utility providers would occur. The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative would also require coordination with utility providers as new construction would occur. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of utilities and service systems impacts.

### **Conclusion**

The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative would be considered environmentally superior in relation to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impacts (two areas) and environmentally inferior in relation to aesthetics impacts (one area). It would be environmentally neutral in relation to cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, public services, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems impacts (nine areas). The adoption of the No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative

would not meet the project objectives identified by the District for the modernization of learning facilities and for campus growth through 2025. The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative fails to accomplish the project objectives in the District’s vision and has environmental impacts that are the same or greater for 10 resource areas (all the neutral and inferior areas mentioned above). The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative does not accommodate future campus growth, it does not allow for the modernization of existing building space to meet instructional needs, it does not allow for the construction of new buildings to meet current and future instructional needs, it does not expand veterans’ facilities and services to train and retrain veterans as they transition into the civilian workforce, and it does not implement health and safety repairs and other needed facility renovations. The No Project/Existing Master Plan Alternative is, therefore, not considered environmentally superior to the proposed project and it does not meet the District’s project objectives.

### **6.3.2 No Project/No Development Alternative**

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate and analyze the impacts of the “No Project” Alternative. When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the “no project” alternative will be the continuation of the plan, policy, or operation into the future. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative assumes no further buildout from the previously approved Facilities Master Plan would occur and the campus would stay in its existing state, with some of the projects from the existing Facilities Master Plan constructed, but no additional projects from the previously approved Facilities Master Plan to be constructed. What remains to be completed from the existing Facilities Master Plan are the following projects: Piazza renovation, Administration third and fourth floor interior renovations, Humanities swing space, student center new building, and Gateway quad landscape. However, under the No Project/No Development Alternative, none of these remaining elements would be constructed and there would be no development as proposed under the Facilities Master Plan.

#### **Aesthetics**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, there would be no change to the current visual appearance of the campus. There would be no changes related to new construction or renovation and no new lighting and glare impacts requiring mitigation. The proposed project requires the application of mitigation to avoid lighting and glare impacts. However, buildout of the No Project/No Development Alternative could be done in such a way that it would be aesthetically pleasing, but it would not include proposed project elements, such as the removal of the exterior concrete stairwells to allow more light into the buildings, removal of tiles to improve maintenance and replacement costs, and updating the look of the buildings’ exteriors. Therefore, the No

Project/No Development Alternative is environmentally neutral to the proposed project in terms of aesthetics impacts.

### **Air Quality**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the campus would continue to function under the direction of the existing Master Plan, which is almost built out, but no additional projects would be built. Less construction would mean that there would be fewer construction-related and operational air quality impacts, and the lack of new buildings would mean that proposed programs would not be served, potentially capping student enrollment. From an environmental standpoint, the No Project/No Development Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project in terms of air quality impacts.

### **Cultural Resources**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the campus would continue to function under the direction of the existing Master Plan, which is almost built out, but no additional projects would be built. Therefore, there would be no impact to character-defining features in the contributors to the Cypress College Historic District. Additionally, archaeological and paleontological resources impacts would not occur and no mitigation would be required. The proposed project would result in impacts to character-defining features in the contributors to the Historic District and would require mitigation to minimize impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered superior when compared to the proposed project in terms of cultural resources impacts.

### **Geology and Soils**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the campus would continue to function under the direction of the existing Master Plan, which is almost built out, but no additional projects would be built. Because there would be no new construction under the No Project/No Development Alternative, and student growth from existing enrollment would not occur, fewer people would be exposed to geology and soils impacts, including earthquakes, ground shaking, liquefaction, and impacts associated with expansive soils. However, under the proposed project, geology and soils are considered less than significant with adherence to existing regulations. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally neutral to the proposed project with regard to geology and soils impacts.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no more construction would occur on the campus. Less construction would mean that there would be less construction-related greenhouse

gas emissions, and the lack of new buildings would mean that proposed programs would not be served, potentially capping student enrollment. While the Facilities Master Plan does not have significant greenhouse gas emissions impacts, there would be greater construction and operational impacts under the proposed project than the No Project/No Development Alternative. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project in terms of greenhouse gas emissions impacts.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

An Environmental Data Resources search returned two listings at the project site in the Leaking Underground Storage Tank database. A review of data from the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker site and the Orange County Department of Environmental Health records indicate that these two listings are for the same release case. Records for this case indicate a release of waste oil to soil; the case was closed in October 1992. However, under the proposed project, impacted soils could be encountered during demolition and construction. Furthermore, due to the age of buildings planned for renovation and demolition, contaminated materials and hazardous substances like lead-based paint or asbestos could be released. Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, demolition and renovation of buildings would not occur and any Leaking Underground Storage Tank sites would not be encountered during construction because construction activity would cease. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is environmentally superior compared to the proposed project in terms of hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, there would be no hydrology and water quality impacts because construction activity would cease. The amount of pervious and impervious surfaces would remain the same as the current condition. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior when compared to the proposed project in terms of hydrology and water quality impacts.

### **Land Use**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the campus would continue to function under the direction of the existing Master Plan, which is almost built out, but no additional projects would be built. Therefore, no conflict with relevant goals and policies of the City of Cypress General Plan and zoning code would occur. Additionally, the proposed project would promote consistency with relevant goals and policies of the Cypress General Plan and zoning code. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of land use impacts.

## **Noise**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, there would be no noise impacts because construction activity would cease. Most of the noise impacts identified under the proposed project area are related to construction. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior when compared to the proposed project in terms of noise impacts.

## **Public Services**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no more construction would occur on the campus and the existing Master Plan would not be built out. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not generate additional calls for service. Under the proposed project, there would be additional demand for fire and police services related to projected campus growth; however, annual projected calls would be minor and there would be no need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of public services impacts.

## **Traffic and Circulation**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no more new construction would occur on the campus and the existing Master Plan would not be built out. There would be no traffic impacts under the proposed project. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of traffic impacts.

## **Utilities and Service Systems**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no more construction would occur on the campus and the existing Master Plan would not be build out. Under the proposed project, there would be a need for additional water, wastewater, and landfill services related to projected campus growth. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior when compared to the proposed project in terms of utilities and service systems impacts.

## **Conclusion**

The No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior in almost all resource areas. It would be environmentally neutral in five areas (aesthetics, geology and soils, land use, public services, and traffic and circulation). The adoption of the No Project/No Development Alternative would not meet the project objectives identified by the

District for modernization of learning facilities and for campus growth through 2025. The No Project/No Development Alternative does not accommodate future campus growth, it does not allow for the modernization of existing building space to meet instructional needs, it does not allow for the construction of new buildings to meet current and future instructional needs, it does not expand veterans’ facilities and services to train and retrain veterans as they transition into the civilian workforce, and it does not implement health and safety repairs and other needed facility renovations. The No Project/No Development Alternative is, therefore, not considered environmentally superior to the proposed project because it does not meet the District’s project objectives.

### 6.3.3 Preservation Alternative

In response to the finding that there is evidence of a Historic District on campus (see the Cultural Resources Study included as Appendix C to the Program EIR), an alternative was developed to represent a preservation option. The Preservation Alternative suggests the preservation of character-defining features on Historic District contributor buildings in the campus core (see Table 6-1) and reuse, rather than demolition, of the SEM building. The SEM building could become classrooms and be used as swing space as needs change.

**Table 6-1**  
**Inventory of 1960s and 1970s Buildings within the**  
**Potential Cypress College Historic District**

Building Name (No.)	Year Built	Historic District Status
College Complex (6)	1969	Contributor
Fine Arts (2)	1969	Contributor
Gymnasium I (7)	1969	Contributor
Student Activities Center (8)	1969	Contributor
Technical Education I (10)	1969	Contributor
Cooling Tower	1969	Contributor
Campanile	1969	Contributor
Ponds/grounds	1969	Contributor
Piazza Structure	1969–1976	Contributor
Pool Facilities	1970	Contributor
Business Education (9)	1973	Contributor
Science, Engineering, and Math (3)	1973	Contributor
Block House Storage/Restrooms (31)	1973	Contributor
Technical Education II (12)	1973-1974	Contributor
HVAC (37)	1972-1976	Contributor
Technical Education III (13)	1975-1976	Contributor
Gymnasium II (11)	1976	Contributor
Humanities (1)	1976	Contributor

**Table 6-1**  
**Inventory of 1960s and 1970s Buildings within the**  
**Potential Cypress College Historic District**

Building Name (No.)	Year Built	Historic District Status
Humanities Lecture Hall	1976	Contributor
Theater Arts (4)	1976	Contributor
Baseball Storage/Clubhouse (25)	1970–1979	Non-Contributor
Softball Storage/Clubhouse (26)	1970–1979	Non-Contributor

### Aesthetics

The Facilities Master Plan focuses on the construction of new buildings on campus as well as renovations and additions to existing buildings to meet instructional needs that are also aesthetically pleasing, expansion of veterans’ facilities and services, opportunities to improve circulation, health and safety repairs, energy-efficient enhancements, water conservation, and building security upgrades. The Preservation Alternative proposes the preservation and reuse of the SEM building and preservation of character-defining features on contributor buildings such as those that exhibit the following characteristics:

- Rectangular or square in plan
- Board-formed concrete walls (both interior and exterior)
- Rounded, smooth concrete stairwells (projecting from exterior of buildings and piazza)
- Wide exterior staircases with sharp, angular profile (piazza)
- Colored glass mosaic tiles (orange, yellow, brown, blue)
- Piazza connections
- Reflected ceilings (concrete coffers on underside of piazza and interior buildings)
- Cross-shaped, smooth, formed-concrete posts (interior and exterior)
- Angled fascia over front entrances with horizontal board-formed concrete (rest of building is typically vertical board-formed concrete)
- Recessed entrances
- Wide curb handrail on staircases
- Metal louvers (exterior)
- Tinted glass window panels
- Cast metal lettering on exterior walls

- Angled roof skylights
- Diving platform
- Concrete furniture.

There would likely need to be a greater effort made to integrate new building design with the existing buildings' design, as well as an effort to restore the existing buildings in a way that preserves their historic integrity. Preservation of the buildings could be done in such a way that they would be aesthetically pleasing, but it would hinder the ability to remove the exterior concrete stairwells to allow more light into the buildings, remove the tiles to improve maintenance and replacement costs, or remove piazza connections. The Preservation Alternative keeps the Brutalist-style architectural theme intact, but does not meet the District's objectives to remove concrete stairwells, remove tiles, and remove piazza connections. Therefore, the Preservation Alternative is environmentally inferior to the proposed project in terms of aesthetics impacts because it would not meet the project objectives of the Facilities Master Plan.

### **Air Quality**

Because there would be less new construction under the Preservation Alternative, there would be fewer construction-related air quality impacts. Operational impacts are expected to be very similar to the proposed project. Therefore, the Preservation Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project in terms of air quality impacts.

### **Cultural Resources**

The Preservation Alternative would focus on the preservation and reuse of structures on campus that comprise the Historic District. Because these buildings would be retained in place, the historic integrity of the district would remain, and historic resources impacts under this alternative would be considered less than significant. Because there would be less new construction, the potential for impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources would be less, although these impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level under both the proposed project and Preservation Alternative. Therefore, the Preservation Alternative would be considered environmentally superior with regard to cultural resources impacts because of the focus on retaining Historic District contributors and character-defining features of buildings within the campus core.

### **Geology and Soils**

Although construction activity would be reduced under the Preservation Alternative, the same number of students would likely be exposed to geology and soils impacts, including earthquakes, ground shaking, and liquefaction, regardless of whether they would be housed in a new or an old

building. The buildings on campus were designed after 1933 when it was required that school buildings meet the requirements of the Field Act. Furthermore, any efforts to restore and reuse the older buildings would involve a structural integrity analysis related to any proposed reuse of the structures. Therefore, the Preservation Alternative would be considered environmentally neutral to the Facilities Master Plan with regard to geology and soils impacts.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Less new construction would mean that there would be less construction-related greenhouse gas emissions. While the Facilities Master Plan does not have significant greenhouse gas emissions impacts, there would be greater construction and operational impacts under the proposed project than the Preservation Alternative. Therefore, the Preservation Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project in terms of greenhouse gas emissions impacts.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Due to the age of the building planned for demolition as part of the proposed project and the potential for renovation of portions of buildings that may be considered historic or have character-defining features, contaminated materials and hazardous substances, like lead-based paint or asbestos, could be released. Impacts would also occur for the Preservation Alternative because renovation of existing buildings, although performed in a way that would not compromise character-defining features, could also result in the release of contaminated materials and hazardous substances, like lead-based paint or asbestos. Therefore, the Preservation Alternative is environmentally neutral compared to the proposed project in terms of hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

The proposed project and the Preservation Alternative have hydrology and water quality impacts that can be mitigated, although there would be fewer impacts under the Preservation Alternative because there is less new construction. These impacts were primarily related to the potential for erosion and water quality impacts during construction. The amount of pervious and impervious surfaces would be similar under the proposed project and the Preservation Alternative, thus operational impacts related to hydrology and water quality are expected to be the same. Therefore, the Preservation Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of hydrology and water quality impacts.

### **Land Use**

The Preservation Alternative and the proposed project would promote consistency with relevant goals and policies of the City of Cypress General Plan and zoning code. Therefore, the

Preservation Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of land use impacts.

### **Noise**

The proposed project and the Preservation Alternative have noise impacts that can be mitigated. These impacts were primarily related to the potential for noise impacts during construction. Because the Preservation Alternative would have less new construction, it is likely there would be fewer noise impacts. However, noise impacts would likely be mitigated to less than significant. Therefore, the Preservation Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of noise impacts.

### **Public Services**

Impacts to public services under the proposed project are less than significant, and it is anticipated that these impacts would be very similar under the Preservation Alternative. It can be assumed that this would be true for the Preservation Alternative as well because the need for these services is tied to projected growth more than the types of buildings that are being used. Therefore, the Preservation Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of public services impacts.

### **Traffic and Circulation**

Under the proposed project, impacts are less than significant. Because projected growth under the Preservation Alternative is assumed to be very similar (the growth-inducing elements would still exist under this plan), traffic and circulation impacts are assumed to be similar. Therefore, the Preservation Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of traffic and circulation impacts.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

Under the proposed project, there would be a need for additional water, wastewater, and landfill services related to campus growth on the proposed project site. However, these impacts are considered less than significant. Because projected growth under the Preservation Alternative is assumed to be very similar (the growth-inducing elements would still exist under this plan), utility and service systems impacts are assumed to be similar. Therefore, the Preservation Alternative is considered neutral when compared to the proposed project in terms of utilities and service systems impacts.

## Conclusion

The Preservation Alternative would be considered environmentally superior in air quality, cultural resources, and greenhouse gas emissions (three areas). It would be environmentally inferior in aesthetics (one area) and environmentally neutral with regard to geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, public services, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems (eight areas). The cost to renovate and preserve the SEM building would cost \$82.4 million, while construction of the new SEM building would cost \$89.9 million. Considering renovation of the SEM building would not result in the upgrades needed to meet the educational goals for the campus, the Preservation Alternative would divert significant public funds (approximately \$82.4 million) from the construction of badly needed new instructional buildings that would meet the District's educational goals. Additionally, several millions of dollars related to operations and maintenance would be saved if construction of a new SEM building would occur, as the existing SEM building would serve as swing space during renovation of other instructional facilities (Miranda, pers. comm. 2016). The adoption of the Preservation Alternative would not meet the project objectives identified by the District for campus growth through 2025 because of the need for a new SEM building and renovated buildings to meet the educational goals for the campus. The Preservation Alternative fails to fully accomplish the project objectives in the District's vision but has fewer environmental impacts than the proposed project. Because the Preservation Alternative has fewer environmental impacts and it avoids a significant impact to the Historic District, it is environmentally superior to the proposed project.

## 6.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Table 6-2 shows that the environmentally superior alternative under CEQA is the No Project/No Development Alternative. However, when the No Project Alternative is environmentally superior, CEQA mandates another alternative be identified (14 CCR 15126.6(e)(2)). . Thus, the Preservation Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative under CEQA because it reduces the significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources.

**Table 6-2**  
**Comparison of Alternatives**

Impact	No Project/Existing Master Plan	No Project/No Development	Full Preservation
Aesthetics	-1	0	-1
Air Quality	+1	+1	+1
Cultural Resources	0	+1	+1
Geology and Soils	0	0	0
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	+1	+1	+1

**Table 6-2  
Comparison of Alternatives**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>No Project/Existing Master Plan</b>	<b>No Project/No Development</b>	<b>Full Preservation</b>
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	0	+1	0
Hydrology and Water Quality	0	+1	0
Land Use	0	0	0
Noise	0	+1	0
Public Services	0	0	0
Traffic and Circulation	0	0	0
Utilities and Service Systems	0	+1	0
Total (environmentally superior only)	2	7	3
<b>Eliminates a Significant Impact of the Proposed Project</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>

0 = environmentally neutral; -1 = environmentally inferior; +1 = environmentally superior

## 6.5 REFERENCES

Miranda, A. 2016. "1999 Facilities Master Plan Previous Projects." Personal communication (email) from A. Miranda (Director of Physical Plant & Facilities, Cypress College) to S. Rittel (Project Manager, Campus Capital Projects, Cypress College) to R. Struglia (Project Manager, Dudek) and C. Munson (Environmental Analyst, Dudek). August 10, 2016.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK