
VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE MASTER PLAN

A. INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

As stipulated in Section 21002.1(a) of the CEQA Statutes (Public Resources Code):

The purpose of an environmental impact report is to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to a project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided.

More specifically, the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6) require an EIR to 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. The discussion of alternatives, however, need not be exhaustive, but rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are deemed “infeasible.”

Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparable merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decisionmaking and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.

Purpose

Section 15126.6(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment, the 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 project objectives, or would be more costly.

Selection of a Reasonable Range of Alternatives

Section 15126.6(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. 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.

Level of Detail

The State CEQA Guidelines do not require the same level of detail in the alternatives analysis as in the analysis of the proposed project. Section 15126.6(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. A matrix displaying the major characteristics and significant environmental effects of each alternative may be used to summarize the comparison. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to 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.

Project Objectives

SMC's specific land use and planning objectives identified for the Bundy Campus in the Master Plan are as follows:

- To advance the mission of SMC to create a learning environment that both challenges its students and supports them in achieving their educational goals;
- To advance the mission of SMC to prepare its students to contribute to the global community as they develop an understanding of their personal relationship to the world's social, cultural, political, economic, technological, and natural environments;
- To further SMC's adopted goals in the area of promoting student success, advancing academic excellence, developing community partnerships, and providing a supportive physical environment;

- To create a state-of-the-art satellite campus that reflects SMC's commitment to providing the best possible educational environment;
- To develop a Master Plan that demonstrates SMC's commitment to the use of sustainable resources and energy efficient building standards;
- To incorporate technology to support the Bundy Campus' self-sufficiency, to exert a direct influence on traffic and parking mitigation, and to enhance learning and teaching opportunities;
- To create an organized and unified development plan that concentrates new construction in a manner that maximizes both educational space and open space;
- To create a campus that can accommodate all of its parking needs onsite; and
- To manage SMC's overall expansion by establishing and operating largely self-contained satellite campuses such as is envisioned for the Bundy Campus.

Overview of Selected Alternatives

As indicated above, project alternatives should feasibly be able to attain "most of the basic objectives of the project" (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)), even though implementation of the project alternatives might, to some degree, impede the attainment of those objectives or be more costly (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b)). Therefore, for purposes of this alternatives analysis and to compare the merits of an alternative's ability to reduce environmental impacts and meet the Master Plan's objectives, the following Alternatives were defined and analyzed (brief descriptions are provided herein with more detailed descriptions provided later in this Section):

- No Project Alternatives:
 - No Project Alternative (1) - Under this Alternative, the Master Plan would not be adopted and implemented. The existing four-story West Building would remain on the Bundy Campus and continue to provide SMC classes within the existing 16 classrooms currently in use and the existing East Building would remain vacant and would not be occupied by SMC activities. No access, parking, or landscaping improvements identified under the Master Plan would occur under this Alternative. Under this Alternative, those programs slated to move to the New Building under the Master Plan, would remain at the Main Campus.
 - No Project Alternative (2) - Under this Alternative, the Master Plan would not be adopted and implemented and the entire site would be developed with 494,100 square feet (sf) of commercial office development (with approximately 1,728 employees) and a multi-level 2,000-space parking garage. This office space would be provided within three new six-floor office buildings providing a total of 468,000 sf of office space and the existing East Building which would be renovated to provide 26,100 sf of office space. This Alternative would result in reduced permeable surface area as compared to the Master Plan. Under this Alternative,

- all programs currently provided within the renovated West Building would be moved back to the Main Campus and those programs slated to move to the New Building under the Master Plan would remain at the Main Campus.
- No Project Alternative (3) - Under this Alternative, the Master Plan would not be adopted and implemented and the entire site would be re-graded and developed with 625 new multi-family residential units (housing approximately 1,413 residents) provided within several six-story buildings and a multi-level 1,250-space parking garage. This Alternative would result in reduced permeable surface area as compared to the Master Plan. Under this Alternative, all programs currently provided within the renovated West Building would be moved back to the Main Campus and those programs slated to move to the New Building under the Master Plan would remain at the Main Campus.
 - Renovated East Building Alternative – This Alternative would include the continued use of the renovated West Building and the renovation of the two-story East Building at the existing location to provide classroom uses. Approximately the same building density, number of students, and number of vehicles trips would occur under this Alternative as under the Master Plan. The Renovated East Building Alternative would provide 609 surface parking spaces and would not provide any subterranean parking. Therefore, this Alternative would result in reduced landscaping and permeable surface area as compared to the Master Plan.
 - Access Alternatives – These 17 Access Alternatives (including the No Project Access Alternative) demonstrate a comparison of the various accesses to the Bundy Campus that may be provided under the Master Plan. The Access Alternatives include: ten Access Alternatives that would provide access to the Bundy Campus via the existing Bundy Driveway at its current location on Bundy Drive and via Airport Avenue accesses (i.e., Access Alternatives A1 through A10); four Access Alternatives that would provide access to the Bundy Campus via a new Northeast Bundy Driveway on Bundy Drive and via Airport Avenue accesses (i.e., Access Alternatives B1 through B4); and two Access Alternatives that would provide access to the Bundy Campus via a new driveway on Bundy Drive consolidated with Airport Avenue and via additional Airport Avenue accesses (i.e., Access Alternatives C1 and C2). These 17 Access Alternatives are analyzed in detail in Section IV.J (Transportation and Traffic) of this Draft EIR.

Alternatives Rejected as Being Infeasible

Section 15126.6(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the Lead Agency's determination. 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. The following alternatives were considered and rejected by SMC:

- **Off-site Alternative - Expansion of Existing Campus:** An alternative involving the same development envisioned under the Master Plan, but at another existing SMC satellite campus or the Main Campus was considered and rejected. The SMC Main Campus lacks the capacity for an additional building and none of the other existing satellite campuses in the District are greater than four acres such that they could accommodate the new classrooms and parking envisioned under the Master Plan. Therefore, this alternative was rejected as infeasible.
- **Off-site Alternative - Development of New Satellite Campus:** An alternative involving the same development envisioned under the Master Plan, but at a new SMC satellite campus at the northern boundaries of the District (i.e., Malibu) was considered and rejected as infeasible. This location for the Bundy Campus and its programs would not meet the Master Plan objectives that aim to maximize educational space and open space, provide a supportive physical environment, provide the best possible educational environment, and manage SMC's overall expansion, as it would not attract the same students as the Bundy Campus, and, therefore, would not serve to shift the same programs from the Main Campus that currently require additional space. Therefore, this alternative was rejected due to failure to meet basic project objectives.
- **Stewart Avenue Access Alternative:** An alternative involving the development of the Master Plan but with full access at Stewart Avenue was considered and rejected. This alternative would not reduce significant air, noise, and traffic impacts at sensitive receptor locations in surrounding neighborhoods, and would not meet the Master Plan objectives that aim to develop community partnerships, provide a supportive physical environment, and exert a direct influence on traffic mitigation, because this alternative would involve substantial college-related traffic traveling through surrounding residential neighborhoods to the south and west of the Bundy Campus. Therefore, this alternative was rejected as it would not meet basic project objectives and would not reduce significant project impacts.

Assumptions and Methodology

The anticipated means for implementation of the alternatives can influence the assessment and/or probability of impacts for those alternatives. For example, a project may have the potential to generate impacts, but considerations in project design may also afford the opportunity to avoid or reduce such impacts. The alternatives analysis is presented as a comparative analysis to the Master Plan, and assumes that all applicable mitigation measures proposed for the Master Plan would apply to each Alternative. Impacts associated with the Alternatives are compared to the Master Plan's impacts and are classified as increased, reduced, or essentially similar to the level of impacts associated with the Master Plan.

The following alternatives analysis compares the potential environmental impacts of the No Project Alternative (1), No Project Alternative (2), No Project Alternative (3), Renovated East Building Alternative, and Access Alternatives with those of the Master Plan for each of the environmental topics analyzed in detail in Section IV (Environmental Impact Analysis) of this Draft EIR.