

---

## 6. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

### 1. INTRODUCTION

---

#### 1. 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) requires 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.”

#### 2. SELECTION OF A REASONABLE RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES

Guidance for drafting the alternatives analysis is provided in Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, which 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 decision-making 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.*

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.*

### **3. LEVEL OF DETAIL**

The State CEQA Guidelines do not require the same level of detail in the alternatives analysis as provided for in the analysis of the Proposed Project (Section 4.0, Environmental Analysis). Rather, Section 15126.6(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides that:

*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.*

### **4. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT DISMISSED**

During the planning process, the Applicant considered several alternatives to the Proposed Project for purposes of satisfying the CEQA mandate to evaluate a reasonable range of Project Alternatives. Of the alternatives considered, an alternative project site was dismissed from further consideration. As noted in Section 2.0 Project Description, SMC's primary objectives are specific to securing an interest in real property within the City of Malibu and restoring the College's presence in Malibu by establishing a permanent satellite campus in the City of Malibu. Thus, alternative sites that are not located within the City of Malibu were not considered, as they would fail to meet the Applicant's primary objectives. Accordingly, the selection of potential alternative sites was focused on properties within the City of Malibu. An Alternative Project Site within the City of Malibu would not be a feasible alternative, as it would not address many of the Project's Objectives as identified in Section 2.0 Project Description, that are aimed at promoting the use of sustainable resources and would specifically not address SMC's objective to enter into a partnership with Los Angeles County to redevelop and reactivate an underutilized portion of the Civic Center owned by the County of Los Angeles. The development of the Proposed Project at any other site within the City of Malibu would leave the proposed Project Site vacant and underutilized, while a new location would be developed to construct the necessary structure and associated parking lots. The selection of an alternative site is further constrained by the lack of Institutionally Zoned properties within the City that are centrally located. Within the City of Malibu, nearly all of the Institutionally Zoned parcels are currently developed with public facilities and institutional land uses such as fire stations, public or private schools, or religious institutions and are not available for acquisition. One relatively large vacant Institutionally Zoned Site, located north of the Civic Center on the east side of Malibu Canyon Road north of Malibu Crest Drive would require extensive grading and removal of native vegetation. Development of this lot would require extensive geotechnical remediation to engineer a suitable development pad as the vacant lot is located on steep terrain. These characteristics render the Institutionally-zoned vacant lot infeasible for development of a community

college facility. Development of this parcel would not satisfy the Applicant's sustainable development goals and would leave the proposed Project Site vacant and underutilized.

Another alternative that was evaluated but rejected from further consideration was the potential renovation and reuse of the existing Sheriff's Station building. This Alternative evaluated the possibility of renovating and repurposing the existing building with the proposed community college facility and Sheriff Substation. However, after an initial evaluation of the strict Division of State Architects (DSA) building code requirements to satisfy life safety standards, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board's mandate to connect to the proposed Civic Center Wastewater Treatment Plant, which would require extensive plumbing improvements, this alternative was determined to be infeasible and was dropped from further analysis.

## 5. 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 stated objectives of the Proposed Project as identified in Section 2.0, Project Description, the following Alternatives were defined and analyzed (brief descriptions are provided herein with more detailed descriptions provided later in this Section):

- **No Project Alternative:** The No Project Alternative would be the result of not approving the Proposed Project. Under this scenario, the existing Sheriff Station building and communications tower would remain in place and no further development or improvements would occur on-site in the foreseeable future. The existing former Sheriff's Station would remain vacant.
- **Zoning Compliant Alternative:** This Alternative would consist of redesigning the Proposed Project to fully conform to the Malibu Zoning Code and LCP for purposes of avoiding the variances that are currently being requested. The height of the structure would be reduced to 28 feet to conform to the height limit of the Institutional zone and the Project would be redesigned to accommodate the required parking spaces in conformance with the City's parking stall dimensions. Under this scenario, the new building would be a single-story community college facility with approximately 18,730 square feet of floor area including an approximate 4,230 square foot Sheriff's Substation. Under this scenario the communications tower would remain in place and would not be upgraded.

---

## **6. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

### **2. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

---

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

CEQA requires the alternatives analysis to include a No Project Alternative. The purpose of analyzing a No Project Alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1)). Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2):

*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 the environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project were not approved, based on current plans, and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.*

#### **2. DESCRIPTION OF THE NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

Under the No Project Alternative, the Proposed Project Site would remain in its current state. There would be no activities on-site as it pertains to the utilization of the existing infrastructure for college or institutional land uses. The Project Site is currently improved with the former Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Substation, which includes approximately 23,882 square feet of gross floor area. The Sheriff’s Substation was decommissioned in the early 1990s and remains largely unused and vacant. The No Project Alternative would not result in any physical changes to the existing Sheriff Station building and the Project Site would remain vacant into the foreseeable future. The Civic Center would remain in operation under the control and authority of the County of Los Angeles without any association with SMC.

#### **3. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

Following is an analysis of the anticipated environmental impacts associated with the No Project Alternative described above. Only those environmental issue areas analyzed in Section 4 of this Draft EIR for the proposed Santa Monica College Malibu Campus have been included in the analysis below.

##### **Aesthetics/Views**

The No Project Alternative would not involve any new construction or demolition associated with the Proposed Project. No improvements or physical modifications would occur and the Project Site would remain in its present form. Therefore, views on and around the Proposed Project would remain unchanged (see Figures 4.1.1 through 4.1.5 for existing views of the Project Site and its vicinity). Additionally, the No Project Alternative would maintain the existing sources of lighting and glare on the Project Site and in the surrounding area. Since the No Project Alternative includes no physical alternations to the current site, the No Project Alternative would have no impact when compared to the Proposed Project. However, it is worth noting that under the No Project Alternative, the Project Site would remain vacant and would not

be gentrified with new architecture and the associated hardscape and attractive landscaping features that would occur under the Proposed Project.

### **Air Quality**

A significant impact would occur if a project would considerably increase the release of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in non-attainment; if a project would conflict with applicable air quality plans or violate any air quality standards; or if a project were to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The No Project Alternative would not create any construction emissions, as demolition and construction activities would not occur, and on-site operations would remain the same. The ambient air quality would remain unchanged, with the exception of the cumulative air quality impacts created by other related projects in the study area. Hence, the No Project Alternative would have a reduced air quality impact when compared to the Proposed Project.

### **Cultural Resources**

Chumash archaeological sites and resources are important and sensitive cultural resources in Malibu, particularly near Malibu Lagoon. The Project Site was initially surveyed for cultural resources by the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) on May 20, 2013. Five archaeological sites and two above-ground historic resources have been identified on maps within a ½ –mile radius of the Project Site. The Project Site survey concluded that no evidence of either prehistoric or historic artifacts or features have been found on the Project Site.

Under the No Project Alternative, no new construction or physical modification associated with the Proposed Project would occur on the Project Site. As such, no potential exists for the accidental discovery of archeological, paleontological, or human remains caused by construction activities. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact to cultural resources. When compared to the Proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would have a reduced impact upon cultural resources.

### **Geology and Soils**

A significant impact may occur if a project would place a new structure or building in an area that is susceptible to geological hazards or unstable soils. Under the No Project Alternative, the Project Site remains in its current condition and retains its current on-site operations. The No Project Alternative does not include the construction of any new structures or buildings. As such, the No Project Alternative would not result in any new sources or increased risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, or ground failure on-site. The No Project Alternative would have no impact to geology and soils. When compared to the Proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would have a reduced impact upon potential geotechnical hazards.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

A significant impact would occur if a project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, or if a project, would conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The No Project Alternative would not create any new sources of greenhouse gas emissions, since

demolition and Project construction would not occur and on-site operations would remain the same. The ambient greenhouse gas emissions would remain unchanged with the exception of the cumulative greenhouse gases generated by other related projects in the study area. Hence, the No Project Alternative would have reduced GHG emissions when compared to the Proposed Project.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

A significant impact may occur if a project produces a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; if a project would upset and accidentally release hazardous materials into the environment; if a project would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; or if a project is located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

The Project Site is listed on the Leaking Underground Storage Tank list for three former USTs. As discussed above, the Project Site LUST was issued closure by the County of Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board and the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works in the 1990s, which indicates that the investigation and/or remediation have been completed to their satisfaction. The LUST classification on the Project Site represents a historic recognized environmental condition (REC) in connection with the Project Site. No RECs currently exist on the Project Site. Additionally, there are two sites that are located within a one-mile radius of the Project Site that have documented spills or leaks of gasoline. These listings are not considered to represent RECs in relation to the Project Site. As concluded in the Phase II Report, no evidence was found to suggest that the Project Site's soil, soil vapor, or groundwater contamination is present at levels of concern.

The No Project Alternative does not include any construction or alterations to the Project Site and does not include any additional or new sources of hazardous materials that have not been previously in use. Therefore, the No Project Alternative will not produce any new hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials. As such, no impact would occur. When compared to the Proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would have a reduced impact upon hazards and risk of upset.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

A significant impact may occur if a project proposes a development project that would degrade local water quality, alter existing drainage patterns or stormwater discharge flows, or substantially deplete groundwater supply. The No Project Alternative does not include the construction, alteration, or expansion of existing structures on-site. As such, the Project will not substantially degrade local water quality, alter existing drainage patterns, or substantially deplete groundwater supply. Thus, no impact will occur. Under this scenario, the No Project Alternative would have a greater impact as compared to the Proposed Project, as development of the Proposed Project would necessitate a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, which would improve the quality of surface water runoff as compared to current conditions. The beneficial impacts of installing permeable paving, additional landscape areas within the parking lot, and treating the first 3/4-inch rainfall event would not be realized under this alternative.

A significant impact may occur if a project proposes a development project that would place housing

within a 100-year floodplain or in an area susceptible to flooding due to levee or dam failure or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The Project does not include the construction, alternation, or expansion of existing structures on-site. No new housing or habitable structures would be constructed as part of the No Project Alternative. Thus, the Project will not result in any housing being placed within a 100-year floodplain or in an area susceptible to flooding due to levee or dam failure or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The No Project Alternative would result in no new impacts associated with flooding and inundation.

### **Land Use and Planning**

Under the No Project Alternative, the Project Site would experience no changes in land uses or changes to the condition of the Project Site. The Zoning designation of the Project Site is Institutional and the General Plan Land Use Designation is Institutional.

The Proposed Project is bounded by vacant land to the north and west, Civic Center Way and Legacy Park to the south, and the existing Civic Center Complex to the east. The Project Site is located within the existing Los Angeles County Civic Center Complex in the City of Malibu. The Civic Center Complex currently includes the municipal land uses: Courthouse (vacant), Library, Waterworks, Sheriff's Substation (vacant).

The Project Site encompasses 399,880 sf (9.18 acres) of Civic Center lot area and 128,500 sf (2.95 acres) of SMC (Santa Monica College) lease lot area. The Project Site currently houses the Sheriff's Substation (vacant), which includes 23,882 square feet of developed floor area. The No Project Alternative would result in no changes to the existing Civic Center Complex. Because the property was developed prior to the incorporation of the City of Malibu, some features within the Malibu Civic Center property are considered existing non-conforming land uses; such as, the height of the existing emergency communications tower and the size of the existing parking stalls. Under the No Project Alternative, the Project Site would maintain and continue the use of the existing emergency communication tower and parking stalls. No impact would occur since these structures and uses are currently in place and operational.

Since the No Project Alternative would result in no changes to the current land use and zoning designations or to the physical condition of the Project Site, the No Project Alternative would have no impact to land use and planning and no discretionary permits would be required.

### **Noise**

#### ***Construction***

The No Project Alternative would involve no new construction. As such, no construction noise and vibration is anticipated to occur under this alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, impacts with respect to construction noise or vibration would be reduced as compared to the Proposed Project.

***Operation***

The No Project Alternative would not introduce any new activities to the Project Site with the potential to create operational noise impacts, or sensitive receptors with the potential to be impacted by noise impacts. Under the No Project Alternative, no impact would occur with respect to operational noise. Impacts with respect to operational noise would be reduced when compared to the Proposed Project's less-than-significant impact.

**Public Services*****Fire Protection***

A significant impact would occur if a project were to increase the number of on-site persons beyond the allowable capacity for the Project Site and for the buildings on-site, which may present a fire hazard. The No Project Alternative does not include the construction of any new structures or buildings on-site. There are no changes to on-site operations. Under the No Project Alternative, no impact would occur with respect to fire protection. When compared to the Proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would have a reduced impact.

***Police Protection***

A significant impact would occur if a project were to increase the number of on-site persons that may increase the demand of the local police services. The No Project Alternative does not include the construction of any new structures or buildings on-site. There are no changes to on-site operations. The No Project Alternative would not introduce any additional persons or operations to the Project Site. The No Project Alternative would not result in a new Community Sheriff Substation, a new Emergency Operations and Planning Center, nor a new communications tower. Under the No Project Alternative, a less-than-significant impact would occur with respect to police protection. When compared to the Proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would have an inferior less than significant impact.

**Transportation and Circulation*****Traffic***

A significant impact may occur if project traffic volumes were to increase traffic levels beyond acceptable level of service thresholds as shown in Table 4.11.3, City of Malibu Signalized Intersection Impact Threshold Criteria, and Table 4.11.4, City of Malibu Unsignalized Intersection Impact Threshold Criteria. The No Project Alternative would not generate any new vehicle trips or change circulation patterns. Since the No Project Alternative involves the continued use of the Project Site and existing conditions, the No Project Alternative would not create new impacts to traffic or circulation. When compared to the Proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would have a reduced impact.

***Parking***

A significant impact may occur if a project does not supply sufficient parking spaces for on-site demand, or if the Project Site does not meet the required amount of parking spaces. Not including the Malibu Tow Yard or Waterworks Utility yard areas, which are fenced off and not available to the public, there are



approximately 254 existing parking spaces within the Malibu Civic Center, including 157 spaces in the front lot and 97 spaces in the rear lot. The Project Site houses a decommissioned Sheriff's Substation and the Los Angeles Superior Court building is currently vacant. Based on the existing on-site parking utilization survey contained in the Project Traffic Study (see Appendix J, Traffic, to this EIR), there are enough on-site parking spaces to accommodate the existing demand within the Civic Center. The No Project Alternative would not alter the on-site uses or the on-site parking. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact. When compared to the Proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would have a reduced impact.

## **Public Utilities**

### ***Sewer***

A significant impact would occur if a project were to introduce new on-site uses or persons, which could substantially increase wastewater generation. Under the No Project Alternative, the existing baseline wastewater generation is minimal (since the Project Site is largely vacant). This wastewater generation would remain unchanged. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact. When compared to the Proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would not require the Project Site to tie into the City of Malibu Wastewater Treatment System and would thus have a reduced environmental impact upon wastewater treatment systems.

### ***Water***

A significant impact would occur if a project were to introduce new on-site uses or persons, which could substantially increase water consumption. Under the No Project Alternative, the existing baseline water demand is minimal (since the Project Site is largely vacant). The continuation of the existing on-site operations under the No Project Alternative would not generate any additional demands for wastewater facilities. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact. When compared to the Proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would have a reduced demand for water and thus a reduced environmental impact upon water resources.

### ***Energy***

A significant impact would occur if a project were to introduce new on-site uses or persons, which could substantially increase electricity and natural gas demand. Under the No Project Alternative, the Project Site is assumed to have minimal electricity and natural gas demands, since the Project Site is largely vacant. The continuation of the existing on-site operations under the No Project Alternative would not generate any additional electricity or natural gas demands. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact. When compared to the Proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would have a reduced impact.

---

## **6. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

### **3. ZONING COMPLIANT ALTERNATIVE**

---

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

As stated previously in this Section, the purpose of an EIR 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. (P.R.C. Section 21002.1(a)). As disclosed in Section 5.2 Significant Unavoidable Environmental Impacts, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts associated with construction related noise impacts. Any construction activity that involves demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new community college facility would result in the same construction noise impacts due to the Proposed Project's location. Therefore, the focus of this analysis was aimed at reducing or minimizing the discretionary requests that involve variances from the City of Malibu Zoning Code, as the Project would require the City of Malibu to act upon the requested variances and make the requisite variance findings. While the variances would not result in any significant environmental impacts, the specific variances requested are a matter of concern for purposes of evaluating the Proposed Project's consistency with local land use policies and the California Coastal Act. Thus, for purposes of this EIR, the evaluation of a zoning compliant alternative would afford the decision makers the necessary information to make an informed decision with respect to the circumstances of not approving the requested variances.

#### **2. DESCRIPTION OF THE ZONING COMPLIANT ALTERNATIVE**

For purposes of this alternatives analysis, the Zoning Compliant Alternative would consist of a similar project as proposed, but would include the construction of a new community college and Sheriff's Substation building that conforms to the Malibu Municipal Code, the General Plan, and the Development Standards for the Institutional Zone as set forth in the Local Coastal Program – Local Implementation Plan (LCP-LIP). Due to the relatively high groundwater table in the Civic Center area, it is infeasible to develop a two-story structure within the code-required height limit by extending the Project below grade level. The height of the proposed structure would be reduced to a single-story with a height of 28-feet above grade. Standard classroom size guidelines call for recommended ceiling heights between 12 feet (floor to ceiling) for a typical classroom and 15 feet (floor to ceiling) for lecture halls. The depth and slope of lecture rooms have a direct and critical impact on the required floor to ceiling height of rooms. Additional clear space is also needed above the ceiling, away from mechanical and utility systems to permit installation of screens and structural supports for projection equipment installation. Thus, it would not be possible to develop a two-story facility that is in conformance with the recommended floor-to-ceiling standards for the proposed lecture rooms and under the 28-foot height limit.

Developing the structure within the existing building footprint but without the second story would result in a building that is approximately 18,730 square feet in size. This is roughly three-quarter of the amount of floor area that is proposed under the Proposed Project. The Project would be redesigned to accommodate a Sheriff's Substation that is roughly  $\frac{3}{4}$  the size of what is currently proposed, resulting in a Sheriff's Substation with approximately 4,230 square feet of floor area. The remaining 14,500 square feet

of floor area would be developed with classrooms, lecture halls, science labs and other functional spaces for the college's programs.

The amount of required on-site parking spaces would also be reduced in conformance with the City's parking requirements based on the City of Malibu's standard stall dimensions. Based on the reduction in the Proposed Project's classroom size, this alternative would be capable of supporting approximately 158 FTE students. The parking requirement for this alternative would be 134 spaces for the college uses and 10 spaces for the Sheriff's department for a total of 144 parking spaces.

The communications tower would remain in place and would not be upgraded. The existing communication tower would be able to remain unchanged at its current non-conforming height under the existing provisions of the Malibu Municipal Code. However, if the tower is relocated and/or replaced with a modern structure, the existing allowable height for antennas and satellite equipment would limit the new structure to 28 feet above grade, which would render the communication devices useless for transmitting emergency signals to other satellite and radio antennas in LA County. An antenna height of 28 feet above grade would make it technically impossible to provide for adequate and effective radio and cellular communication between towers. As such the only alternative would be to leave the existing communications tower in place.

### **3. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

Following is an analysis of the anticipated environmental impacts associated with the Zoning Compliant Alternative described above. Only those environmental issue areas analyzed in Section 4.0 of this Draft EIR for the proposed Santa Monica College Malibu Campus have been included in the analyses below.

#### **Aesthetics/Views**

The Zoning Compliant Alternative would result in the redevelopment of the Project Site, which would alter the existing aesthetic character of the Civic Center complex. The structure that would be developed under this alternative would be a maximum of 28 feet in height, which is seven feet-ten inches shorter than the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project's aesthetic impacts were found to be less than significant as the Proposed Project would not block any scenic views of the ocean from the residences on the hillside to the north. Because this project would be shorter and smaller in scale and massing, the Zoning Compliant Alternative would also result in a less than significant aesthetic impact. Impacts would be less than significant and similar to the Proposed Project.

#### **Air Quality**

A significant impact would occur if a project would considerably increase the release of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in non-attainment; if a project would conflict with applicable air quality plans or violate any air quality standards; or if a project were to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The Zoning Compliant Alternative would result in the same level of demolition and site clearing emissions as the Proposed Project, as both the Project and the alternative would require the demolition of the existing Sheriff's Station. The Zoning Compliant Alternative's operational emissions would be reduced by approximately 25 percent, as the Project would be capable of supporting roughly 75% of the Proposed Project's FTE. Impacts to air quality would be similar to the

Project and less than significant during construction and further reduced from the Project's air quality impacts during operation. Overall, the Zoning Compliant Alternative would have reduced air quality impact when compared to the Proposed Project.

### **Cultural Resources**

Under the Zoning Compliant Alternative, the same level of grading and earthwork would be required to redevelop the Project Site. As such, the potential for the accidental discovery of archeological, paleontological, or human remains caused by construction activities would be the same under this Alternative. Therefore, the Zoning Compliant Alternative would have no beneficial impact with respect to avoiding or minimizing potential impacts to cultural resources. When compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would have a less than significant and reduced impact upon cultural resource.

### **Geology and Soils**

A significant impact may occur if a project would place a new structure or building in an area that is susceptible to geological hazards or unstable soils. Under the Zoning Compliant Alternative, the Project Site would be developed with an approximate 18,730 square foot building. The Project Site would be susceptible to the same level of risk associated with strong seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, or ground failure on-site. As such, geologic impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant and slightly reduced as compared to the Proposed Project as the number of people attracted to the Project Site would be reduced and thus not exposed to any danger.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

A significant impact would occur if a project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, or if a project, would conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The Zoning Compliant Alternative's GHG emissions are anticipated to be approximately three-quarters of the emissions reported for the Proposed Project as the amount of building construction and FTA enrollment would be reduced. Thus, the Zoning Compliant Alternative would have less than significant and reduced GHG emissions when compared to the Proposed Project.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

A significant impact may occur if a project produces a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; if a project would upset and accidentally release hazardous materials into the environment; if a project would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; or if a project is located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

The Zoning Compliant Alternative would not include any additional or new sources of hazardous materials that have not been previously in use on the Project Site. Therefore, this Alternative will not

produce any new hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials and impacts would be less than significant and the same as the Project.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

A significant impact may occur if a project would degrade local water quality, alter existing drainage patterns or stormwater discharge flows, or substantially deplete groundwater supply. The Zoning Compliant Alternative would include the same general construction of an existing structure on-site, as the proposed building footprint would be approximately the same size and placed in the approximate location. As such, the Project's water quality impacts would be the same as analyzed under the Project and will not substantially degrade local water quality, alter existing drainage patterns, or substantially deplete groundwater supply. Thus, no impact will occur. Under this scenario, the Zoning Compliant Alternative would still require a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, which would improve the quality of surface water runoff as compared to current conditions. The beneficial impacts of installing permeable paving, additional landscape areas within the parking lot, and treating the first 3/4-inch rainfall event would be less than significant and the same under this alternative.

### **Land Use and Planning**

Under the Zoning Compliant Alternative, by definition, no variances or deviations from the Malibu Municipal Code and/or Local Coastal Program would be required. The Project Site encompasses 128,500 square feet (2.95 acres) of SMC (Santa Monica College) lease lot area. The proposed FAR under this alternative would be reduced to 0.145 to 1. The Zoning Compliant Alternative would have no impact to land use and planning, and no variances to the LCP or Malibu Municipal Code would be required.

### **Noise**

#### *Construction*

The Zoning Compliant Alternative would involve the same type of construction activities associated with the Proposed Project, however a shortened building timeline would be anticipated for a smaller structure. As such, the construction noise and vibration impacts that are anticipated to occur under the Project would also occur under this Alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, impacts with respect to construction noise or vibration would be significant and unavoidable and the same as compared to the Proposed Project.

#### *Operation*

The Zoning Compliant Alternative would introduce the same college and Sheriff's Department activities to the Project Site with the potential to create operational noise impacts, or sensitive receptors with the potential to be impacted by noise impacts. Impacts with respect to operational noise would be reduced when compared to the Proposed Project's less-than-significant impact, as the on-site population and associated vehicles would be reduced by approximately 25 percent.

---

**Public Services*****Fire Protection***

A significant impact would occur if a project were to increase the number of on-site persons beyond the allowable capacity for the Project Site and for the buildings on-site, which may present a fire hazard. The Zoning Compliant Alternative would include the same construction activities on-site. On-site operations would be substantially similar to the Project except that the Project Site would include less buildable floor area and the Project Site would accommodate a reduced on-site population. Under this Alternative, a less-than-significant impact would occur with respect to fire protection. When compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would have a reduced impact.

***Police Protection***

A significant impact would occur if a project were to increase the number of on-site persons that may increase the demand of the local police services. The Zoning Compliant Alternative would include the same construction activities on-site. On-site operations would be substantially similar to the Project except that the Project Site would include less buildable floor area and the Project Site would accommodate a reduced on-site population. Under this Alternative, a less-than-significant impact would occur with respect to police protection. Similar to the Project, this alternative would involve the construction and operation of a Sheriff's Station which would increase the police presence in the area and provide added resources for the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. When compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would have the same level of impacts upon police services.

**Transportation and Circulation*****Traffic***

A significant impact may occur if project traffic volumes were to increase traffic levels beyond acceptable level of service thresholds. The Zoning Compliant Alternative would generate 25% fewer vehicle trips as compared to the Project and would not create new impacts to traffic or circulation. When compared to the Proposed Project, the Zoning Compliant Alternative would have a reduced traffic impact, and traffic impacts would be less than significant.

***Parking***

A significant impact may occur if a project does not supply sufficient parking spaces for on-site demand, or if the Project Site does not meet the required amount of parking spaces. The parking requirement for this alternative would be 134 spaces for the college uses and 10 spaces for the Sheriff's department for a total of 144 parking spaces. It is anticipated that all 144 spaces would be accommodated on site with the standard stall dimensions specified in the Malibu Municipal Code. No variance would be required and no new impacts would result. This Alternative's parking impacts would be less than significant and reduced as compared to the Project.

**Public Utilities*****Sewer***

A significant impact would occur if a project were to introduce new on-site uses or persons, which could substantially increase wastewater generation. Under the Zoning Compliant Alternative, the proposed structure would be contingent upon connecting to the City's Civic Center Wastewater Treatment Facility. The anticipated wastewater generation would be approximately 7,310 gpd less than the Project, which would be accommodated by the City's planned infrastructure. Therefore, the Zoning Compliant Alternative would have a less than significant impact upon wastewater services and reduced as compared to the Proposed Project.

***Water***

A significant impact would occur if a project were to introduce new on-site uses or persons, which could substantially increase water consumption. Under the Zoning Compliant Alternative, the anticipated water use would be approximately 7,610 or approximately 75% of the Proposed Project's water demand. Therefore, this Alternative would have a less than significant impact and impacts upon water resources would be reduced as compared to the Proposed Project.

***Energy***

A significant impact would occur if a project were to introduce new on-site uses or persons, which could substantially increase electricity and natural gas demand. Under this Alternative, the proposed land uses would generate a demand for approximately 225,545 kWh/year of electricity and approximately 52,717 cf/month of natural gas, representing an approximate reduction of 25 percent as compared to the Proposed Project. Energy impacts would be less than significant and reduced as compared to the Proposed Project.

---

## **6. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

### **4. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

---

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be selected among the alternatives that are evaluated in the EIR. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the fewest adverse impacts. As summarized in Table 6-1, Proposed Project and Project Alternatives Impact Comparison, the environmentally superior alternative would be the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would avoid all of the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the Proposed Project. The No Project Alternative would, however, achieve none of the Project Objectives.

When the No Project Alternative is shown to be environmentally superior over the Proposed Project, CEQA requires that another alternative shall be identified as the Environmentally Superior Project Alternative. For purposes of this analysis, the Zoning Compliant Alternative is selected as the environmentally superior alternative. This Alternative was selected as the environmentally superior alternative because of its ability to reduce the Proposed Project’s construction and operational impacts in nearly all impact areas. However, the significant and unavoidable impacts identified for construction related noise would still remain significant and unavoidable under this alternative.



**Table 6-1  
Project and Project Alternatives Environmental Impact Comparison**

<b>Impact Area</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Zoning Compliant Alternative</b>
<b>Aesthetics</b>			
Visual Character	LTS	LTS (Increased)	LTS (Equal)
Scenic Views	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Reduced)
Light/Glare	LTS	LTS (Reduced)	LTS (Equal)
<b>Air Quality</b>			
Construction	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Similar)
Operation	LTS	NI (Reduced)	SU (Reduced)
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	LTS	LTS (Reduced)	LTS (Reduced)
<b>Geology and Soils</b>			
Construction	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Similar)
Operation	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Reduced)
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>			
Construction	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Same)
Operation	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Same)
<b>Hydro/Water Quality</b>			
Construction	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Same)
Operation	LTS	NI (Increased)	LTS (Same)
<b>Land Use and Zoning</b>			
Zoning	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Reduced)
<b>Noise</b>			
Construction Noise/Vibration	SU	NI (Reduced)	SU (Same)
Operation	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Reduced)
<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Reduced)
<b>Public Utilities</b>			
Water	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Reduced)
Wastewater	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Reduced)
Energy	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Reduced)
<b>Public Services</b>			
Police	LTS	NI (Inferior)	LTS (Similar)
Fire	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Reduced)
<b>Traffic and Parking</b>			
Traffic	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Reduced)
Parking	LTS	NI (Reduced)	LTS (Reduced)
<i>Notes:</i>			
<i>All impact statements are based on the level of impact after mitigation.</i>			
<i>NI: No Impact.</i>			
<i>LTS: Less-Than-Significant Impact.</i>			
<i>SU: Significant-Unavoidable Impact.</i>			