

## 5.0 ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that an EIR objectively evaluate a “reasonable” range of alternatives. According to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), “an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, or to the location of the proposed project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the proposed project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” The CEQA Guidelines also state that an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative nor consider alternatives that are infeasible. Under CEQA, the factors that can determine feasibility are site suitability, economic limitations, availability of infrastructure, General Plan consistency, other plan or regulatory limitations, and jurisdictional boundaries. An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.

The alternatives analysis must also include a comparative evaluation of the No Project Alternative per Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines. Through comparison of the alternatives, the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative compared with the proposed project can be weighed and analyzed. Consequently, the No Project Alternative is described below.

### 5.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

As previously discussed, the FMP was adopted in order to implement various school facility construction and renovation projects within LBUSD. In the FMP, the proposed project is designated as a high priority project by the Internal Executive Committee. Consistent with the primary planning goals of the FMP, the project objectives include the following:

1. Creating learning environments to meet the needs of Jordan High School students
  - a. Increase classroom size to meet current educational goals
  - b. Create career technical education labs
2. Renovating and replacing aging infrastructure
  - a. Modernize building systems
  - b. Improve technology infrastructure
  - c. Improve energy efficiency
3. Elimination of portables and bungalows
  - a. Remove portables
4. Maintaining consolidated 9th through 12th grade high school programs
5. School safety and security
  - a. Improve parking and drop-off areas

The LBUSD has adopted the Collaborative for High Performance Schools (CHPS) Criteria as part of the FMP. The mission of the CHPS is to facilitate the design, construction, and operation of high performance schools. These schools are designed to be energy and resource efficient, healthy,

## 5.0 Alternatives

---

comfortable, and well-lit, and to provide amenities for a quality education. Consistent with the goals of the CHPS, additional project objectives include the following:

- Increase student performance with better-designed and healthier facilities;
- Raise awareness of the positive impact and advantages of high performance schools; and
- Provide professionals with better tools to facilitate effective design, construction and maintenance of high performance schools.
- Improve energy and water efficiency; and
- Meets CHPS criteria.

## 5.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED

Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR 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 factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in the EIR are: (1) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (2) infeasibility, and (3) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

### 5.2.1 ALTERNATIVE SITES

Section 15126.(f)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR consider alternative locations to the project site. One of the purposes of the proposed project is to update and improve existing facilities on the Jordan High School campus. On November 4, 2008, the voters in the LBUSD approved Measure K, a \$1.2 billion classroom repair and student safety bond. The proposed project is one of the projects identified in the FMP and funded by Measure K. In accordance with the provisions of Measure K, one of the purposes of the proposed project is to improve and upgrade the campus and classrooms in order to better meet the needs of Jordan High School students. The Cities that the LBUSD boundary falls within, including Long Beach, Lakewood, and Signal Hill, are almost entirely built out and there are few remaining vacant parcels available. In addition, none of the existing vacant parcels are of a comparable size to the 26.9-acre project site and none are located near the existing campus. If a vacant parcel of adequate size for a high school was available to the LBUSD for the proposed project, it would not be economically feasible or practical for the LBUSD to construct an entirely new school on this vacant parcel. In addition, the existing classrooms on the project site would not be renovated or remodeled. As such, this alternative would not achieve any of the objectives of the proposed project.

### 5.2.2 CONCEPTUAL ALTERNATIVES

Following the adoption of the FMP and the passing of the Measure K Bond in 2008, the LBUSD considered various conceptual options for the renovation of the Jordan High School campus. The concepts were considered and eliminated due to lack of the attainment of the goals and objectives associated with the implementation of the LBUSD FMP and the Measure K Bond.

The conceptual alternatives were formulated during the process of preparing the campus master plan between 2011 and 2013. The design concepts considered the need to enlarge classrooms to accommodate multiple academic programs, including various laboratory configurations, as well as to achieve and adhere to a variety of facility needs such as seismic upgrades, natural lighting, and upgraded electrical and ventilation systems.

Originally, a replacement of the majority of the buildings on the campus was considered. This included demolishing all existing buildings except the Administration, Auditorium, and Gymnasium buildings. All new classrooms in the academic buildings were to include approximately 1,100 square feet. Ultimately, the replacement costs and increase in classroom square footage was determined to be cost prohibitive and the classrooms were reduced to the California Department of Education recommended size of 960 square feet.

Additionally, the athletic fields were conceptually designed to maximize space on the small-sized campus. The football field was to be re-oriented in an east-west configuration to allow for a softball/baseball field with a longer outfield, a soccer field, and outdoor pool. There was not enough space for basketball, volleyball, and tennis courts that were needed for the physical education program. The redesign did not meet the requirements of the program and was determined to be financially infeasible. Thus, the football field was determined to remain in its current configuration and the gymnasium would be modernized.

It was determined that the amount of construction and/or renovation required to bring many of the existing buildings into compliance with current codes would be beyond 50 percent of the cost of constructing a new building. Therefore, the determination was made to demolish and replace the classroom buildings in order to expand the classrooms to 960 square feet, add more labs and ancillary spaces, and complete a full modernization of the non-classroom buildings.

### **5.3 ALTERNATIVES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS**

Two alternatives have been carried forward for detailed analysis in this EIR, including the “No Project” alternative as required by CEQA. Based on the environmental analysis conducted for the proposed project, a significant and unavoidable impact was identified for Noise, after the implementation of mitigation measures. The EIR identifies less than significant impacts for Aesthetics, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Transportation and Traffic.

The alternatives carried forward for detailed analysis in this chapter include:

- No Project Alternative
- Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative

Table 5-1 at the end of this chapter provides a comparison of the impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), each alternative was evaluated in sufficient detail to determine whether the overall environmental impacts would be less,

## 5.0 Alternatives

---

similar, or greater than the corresponding impacts of the proposed project. A discussion of each alternative is provided below.

### 5.3.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

According to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(b), the No Project Alternative is defined as the “circumstance under which the proposed project does not proceed.” The impacts of the No Project Alternative shall be analyzed “by projecting 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.” The purpose of describing and analyzing the 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.”

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing campus would not be renovated and modernized. The campus master plan would not be implemented, and the planned demolition and renovation of existing space would not occur. The planned additional parking lot would not be constructed, and the existing parking lot would not be reconfigured. The student drop-off area would not be reconfigured, and the walkways and restrooms would not be upgraded to meet ADA requirements. Under the No Project Alternative the existing Auditorium building would not be upgraded to current seismic codes, and structural upgrades, improvements to the building interior, auditorium stage and seating, lighting and sound systems, fire alarm system, emergency lighting systems and plumbing systems would not occur. The Visual and Performing Arts facility would not be built and the media center would not be renovated. Other landscaping, utility, and site improvements would not occur. No new structures or classrooms would be constructed in order to better meet the needs of Jordan High School students. The environmental characteristics would be the same as those described in the environmental setting subsections of Chapter 3.0.

Under the No Project Alternative, the construction period impacts associated with the proposed project would be avoided because no demolition, construction, or renovation/interior remodeling activities would occur on the project site. Sensitive receptors adjacent to the project site would not be exposed to potential construction noise, vibration, air quality, or GHG effects. The existing project site uses would continue to operate in their current capacity and function. Maintenance activities would occur as needed to maintain the existing facilities.

Similar to the proposed project, operational impacts would be avoided because no changes to the operation of the project site would occur. There would be no net increase in air quality criteria pollutants, or exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Existing uses and traffic design features would not be changed. Under the No Project Alternative, the visual setting of the proposed project site would continue to be institutional buildings. As such, the visual improvements associated with redevelopment of the project site would not occur under this alternative. Further, this alternative would not achieve any of the objectives of the proposed project.

### **5.3.2 MODERNIZATION and RENOVATION/INTERIOR REMODELING ONLY ALTERNATIVE**

The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would include only the renovation and remodeling of the interior of the existing buildings at Jordan High School. The full campus master plan would not be implemented with this alternative. This alternative would include no new construction and no demolition of buildings. The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would include minor building improvements for ADA accessibility and for Division of State Architect Fire & Life Safety compliance. The interior remodeling would include new flooring, new paint, and new building systems. The existing portable classroom on the project site would remain in place with this alternative due to the need for the use of these classroom spaces, which would not be newly constructed elsewhere on the campus. Similar to the proposed project, the athletic facilities would be modernized and upgraded. The construction of this alternative would be less intense than the proposed project, with a shorter duration and quieter construction equipment, as well as no requirement to install stone columns for building foundations. At the completion of construction, the project site would include the same amount of square footage as with existing conditions. The student enrollment and capacity would also remain similar to existing conditions. Because this alternative would not include any newly constructed buildings, the facilities would not be as modern as with the proposed project.

#### **AESTHETICS**

Under the Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative, there would be less visual character impacts during construction as compared to the proposed project. Because there would be no major demolition activities, the visual distraction or intrusion of the construction site would not result in a drastic change compare to the proposed project. As the current campus would remain the same on the exterior, there would be no change in visual character impacts to surrounding uses. Because this alternative would not result in the construction of new buildings, or the implementation of a master plan, the existing lighting and glare conditions would remain. Shade and shadow lengths and durations would not change compared to the existing project conditions because no new structures would be constructed that would be taller or located closer to the adjacent residential uses.

The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would result in reduced impacts to aesthetics no new construction or demolition activities would be required with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

#### **AIR QUALITY**

The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would result in decreased impacts to construction air quality as compared to the proposed project because there would be no new construction and no demolition activities. The short-term construction emissions would be reduced. Long-term operational emissions would not exceed the emissions budgeted for the project site in the AQMP, as they would not change from current conditions.

## 5.0 Alternatives

---

This alternative would not violate air quality standards or contribute to existing or projected air quality violations. No new construction and no demolition activities would take place; therefore, minimal air pollutants would be generated as a result of construction emissions. The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would not result in long-term air quality impacts from operation-related activities, as this alternative would not result in an increase to future enrollment, and would not create new vehicle trips. Construction of the Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would contribute minimally to air quality impacts in the existing nonattainment area and, therefore, would not compound the issue. The residential sensitive receptors near the project site would be less impacted by construction emissions with this alternative because no demolition of buildings would be required.

The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would result in reduced impacts to air quality than the proposed project.

### **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

The construction of the Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would generate reduced GHG emissions compared to the proposed project because the construction period and process would be less intense. There would be minimal construction-related emissions from off-road construction equipment and minimal emissions from on-road vehicle exhaust and equipment required for remodeling and renovation activities. Operational emissions would be minimal because, similar to the proposed project, this alternative does not include an increase in student enrollment, and therefore, vehicle trips to and from the project site would be similar to existing conditions. The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would result in reduced GHG impacts than with the proposed project.

### **NOISE**

The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would involve no new construction and no demolition activities; therefore, it would not likely expose nearby sensitive uses (such as on-site students or adjacent residences) to noise levels above established noise standards.

Unlike the proposed project, there would be no groundborne noise and vibration resulting from this alternative because the installation of stone columns beneath new building foundations would not be required. There would not be significant temporary increases in the ambient noise levels at the project site.

Operational noise associated with student and faculty use of the project site would not be expected to change substantially as a result of the Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative. Overall, the Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would result in decreased noise and vibration impacts as compared to the proposed project.

## **TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC**

The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would not result in significant impacts to traffic and transportation. Similar to the proposed project, the Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would not change the existing land uses on the project site and would not generate additional student enrollment. As such, new vehicle trips would not be generated during operations. Also, the project site ingress and egress points would remain at their existing locations, similar to the proposed project.

During the renovation and remodeling activities on the existing project site buildings, the number of daily vehicle trips within the project site would increase temporarily due to workers traveling to and from the project site. With implementation of the Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative, the increases would be minor and temporary. No significant construction traffic impacts are anticipated with this alternative.

The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would result in reduced impacts to traffic and transportation during construction as compared to the proposed project.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would result in reduced impacts during construction as compared with those of the proposed project, as there would be no new construction and no demolition activities. The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would not implement the campus master plan, nor meet the project objectives. The classrooms on campus would remain undersized and the portable classrooms would continue to be used. The classrooms would not be grouped together into academies, and there would be no creation of modern laboratories for student use. The construction period would be shorter as compared to that of the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, no new land uses would be introduced to the project site. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would have reduced impacts in the areas of aesthetics, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise and vibration, and transportation and traffic. The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would only meet two of the five project objectives.

## **5.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

The “No Project” alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative primarily because no construction or renovation activities would occur on the project site. However, this alternative would not modernize Jordan High School or create learning environments to meet the needs of students. In accordance with Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Table 5-1 provides a comparison of the impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project. The Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would result in reduced impacts as compared to the proposed project in the areas of aesthetics,

## 5.0 Alternatives

---

construction and operational air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, construction and operational noise and vibration, and traffic, primarily because there would be no construction or demolition activities. With implementation of the Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative, aging infrastructure, utilities, and mechanical systems would not be replaced, learning environments may not meet the needs of students, portable classrooms would not be removed, and classrooms would remain undersized at the project site. In addition, the Modernization and Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative would not implement the campus master plan, and therefore, not implement the goals of the FMP. This alternative would meet only two of the five project objectives. As such, the proposed project would be the environmentally superior alternative.

**TABLE 5-1 COMPARISON OF IMPACTS FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impact Area</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Renovation/Interior Remodeling Only Alternative</b>
Aesthetics	III	IV (Less)	IV (Less)
Air Quality:			
Construction	III	IV (Less)	III (Less)
Operation	III	IV (Less)	IV (Less)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	III	IV (Less)	III (Less)
Noise/Vibration			
Construction	I	IV (Less)	III (Less)
Operation	III	IV (Less)	III (Less)
Transportation and Traffic	III	IV (Less)	II (Less)

Notes:

- I: Significant Unavoidable Impact
- II: Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated
- III: Less Than Significant Impact
- IV: No Impact

Less: Impact is lower in magnitude than impacts of the proposed project

Similar: Impact is similar in magnitude to impacts of the proposed project

Greater: Impact is greater in magnitude than impacts of the proposed project

Mixed: Some impacts are less than, similar to, and/or greater in magnitude than impacts of the proposed project

This page is intentionally left blank.