

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 Purpose and Scope

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) include a discussion of reasonable project alternatives that would “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). This chapter identifies potential alternatives to the proposed project and evaluates them, as required by CEQA.

Key provisions of the CEQA Guidelines on alternatives (Section 15126.6[a] through [f]) are summarized below to explain the foundation and legal requirements for the alternatives analysis in the EIR.

- “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 the project objectives, or would be more costly” (15126.6[b]).
- “The specific alternative of ‘no project’ shall also be evaluated along with its impact” (15126.6[e][1]).
- “The no project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published, and at the time the environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. If the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘no project’ alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives” (15126.6[e][2]).
- “The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a ‘rule of reason’ that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project” (15126.6[f]).
- “Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent)” (15126.6[f][1]).

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

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

For each development alternative, this analysis:

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

Per the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), additional significant effects of the alternatives are discussed in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.

7.1.2 Project Objectives

As described in Section 3.2, the following objectives have been established for the proposed project and will aid decision makers in their review of the project, the project alternatives, and associated environmental impacts: The overall purpose of the CollegeTown Specific Plan (Specific Plan or proposed project) is to provide comprehensive direction for the development of the project site, while implementing the goals and policies of The Fullerton Plan. The Specific Plan is guided by objectives developed jointly by the City of Fullerton, California State University of Fullerton (CSUF), and Hope International University (HIU) in April 2011.

- Attract the right mix of retail services, entertainment, office, and urban housing that appeals to students and the greater community.
- Integrate California State University of Fullerton and Hope International University programs, housing, and services into a shared community and college environment.
- Create livable streets that cater to pedestrians and bicyclists. Preserve and enhance existing county bike path on Commonwealth Avenue.
- Be conveniently accessible by bus, streetcar, and local shuttle from Metrolink stations and other activity centers consistent with the goals outlined by the Southern California Association of Governments in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.
- Reduce commuting and extend students’ stay in Fullerton by creating opportunities for congregating, socializing, recreating, and living.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

- Create a seamless learning, living, working, shopping, dining, and recreating environment for the whole Fullerton community.
- Create a high quality, year-round activities calendar that complements other programming in the City and strengthens the area's economic development potential.
- Create a destination identity that attracts the surrounding communities and the larger Orange County area.
- Create a meeting place for the students and faculty from all Fullerton institutions of higher learning.
- Maximize joint development between the universities and private partners for student parking, housing, or other facilities.
- Create a new landscape plaza by closing a segment of Nutwood Avenue between Folino and Titan Drive to vehicular traffic, to allow for safe crossing of pedestrians and bicyclists and provide a central location for community/campus events and everyday outdoor enjoyment.
- Implement the goals of The Fullerton Plan for Focus Area J, Education, to create a student-oriented village developed through a strong town-gown partnership that includes additional retail and entertainment areas that serve new residents and surrounding neighborhoods.
- Provide additional opportunities for residential growth on infill parcels consistent with the goals of the Housing Element.
- Provide an economically stable project that is financially feasible for private sector developers and that produces a net fiscal benefit for the City.

7.2 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The following significant and unavoidable impacts are identified in Chapter 5, *Environmental Analysis*, of this Draft EIR:

Cultural Resources

- **Impact 5.3-1:** Buildout of the CollegeTown Specific Plan would involve demolition of buildings at 601 and 651 Titan Drive that are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, and as Significant Properties by the City of Fullerton. Mitigation Measure 3-2 requires recording of historical and architectural information about the buildings and photo-documentation of the buildings consistent with Historic American Building Survey standards and guidelines. Mitigation Measure 3-3 requires monitoring and documentation of removal of the buildings by a qualified archaeologist to ensure that no archaeological resources predating the buildings are

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

inadvertently lost during demolition. Impact 5.3-1 would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of Mitigation Measures 3-2 and 3-3.

Air Quality

- **Impact 5.2-1:** The proposed project would result in a substantial increase in growth compared to what was identified in the City's General Plan and would exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) regional operational thresholds. As a result, although the project is consistent with the land use strategies to reduce regional vehicle miles traveled, the proposed project could potentially exceed the assumptions in the air quality management plan (AQMP) and would not be considered consistent with the AQMP. Mitigation measures applied for Impact 5.2-2 and Impact 5.2-3 would reduce the project's regional construction-related and operational phase criteria air pollutant emissions to the extent feasible. However, given the potential increase in growth and associated increase in criteria air pollutant emissions, the project would continue to be potentially inconsistent with the assumptions in the AQMP. Impact 5.2-1 would remain significant and unavoidable.
- **Impact 5.2-2:** Project-related construction emissions have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds during ground disturbing activities and during architectural coating phases or could potentially exceed the SCAQMD thresholds if one or more construction phases overlap. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 2-1 through 2-3, construction emissions would be minimized to the extent feasible. Buildout of the CollegeTown Specific Plan would occur over approximately 15 years or longer. Construction time frames and equipment for individual, site-specific projects are not available. There is a potential for multiple developments to be constructed at one time, resulting in significant construction-related emissions. Therefore, despite adherence to Mitigation Measures 2-1 through 2-3, regional construction emissions identified in Impact 5.2-2 would remain significant and unavoidable.
- **Impact 5.2-3:** Operation of the project would generate air pollutant emissions that exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds. Consequently, the project would significantly contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB). Compliance with the Specific Plan and Mitigation Measure 2-4 would require applicants for new development projects within the CollegeTown Specific Plan to designate spaces for electric vehicle charging in order to encourage residents to use zero- or near-zero emission vehicles. Mitigation Measure 2-5 would require installation of energy-efficient appliances to reduce natural gas consumption and energy demand from new buildings. Mitigation Measure 2-6 would ensure that buildings are either more energy efficient than the current building code or would offset building energy use through installation of photovoltaic panels. Mitigation Measure 2-7 would require applicants for nonresidential land uses to implement an employee trip commute reduction plan to further reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips. Compliance with Mitigation Measures 2-4 through 2-7 would reduce operational phase criteria air pollutants to the extent practicable. However, criteria air pollutant emissions would continue to exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds, and Impact 5.2-3 would remain significant and unavoidable.
- **Impact 5.2-4:** Construction activities associated with the CollegeTown Specific Plan would cause short-term increases in the concentration of criteria air pollutants. With implementation of Mitigation

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Measures 2-1 through 2-2, construction emissions would be minimized to the extent feasible. Buildout of the CollegeTown Specific Plan would occur over approximately 15 years or longer. Construction time frames and equipment for individual, site-specific projects are not available. Because existing sensitive receptors may be close to project-related construction activities, construction emissions generated by individual project have the potential to exceed SCAMQD's localized significance thresholds. Therefore, despite adherence to Mitigation Measures 2-1 through 2-2, localized construction emissions identified in Impact 5.2-4 would remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact 5.2-6:** Residential buildings within 90 feet of SR-57 would be exposed to elevated levels of PM₁₀ emissions that exceed the incremental localized significance threshold of 2.5 µg/m³. Mitigation Measure 2-7 would ensure risks are minimized to the extent feasible. It should be noted that over the 5 years of meteorological data evaluated in the air dispersion model, the total number of days the 24-hour PM₁₀ concentrations was over 2.5 µg/m³ with mitigation was one day. Additionally, acute impacts to residents of the project from existing SR-57 emissions, while incrementally higher because of proximity to the freeway, are considered typical for residents in the entire basin, because the maximum background PM₁₀ concentrations in the vicinity of the site already exceed the California ambient air quality standard for the 24-hour and annual averaging times (according to the Central Orange County Monitoring Station). However, due to the high volume of traffic on State Route 57, minimum efficiency rating value (MERV) filters would not reduce concentrations of PM below the 24-hour AAQS one day per year. Consequently, Impact 5.2-6 would remain significant and unavoidable.

Noise

- **Impact 5.9-4:** Construction activities associated with the CollegeTown Specific Plan would result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels near noise-sensitive receptors. Mitigation Measure 9-4 would reduce noise generated by construction activities associated with the project to the extent feasible. Project-related construction activities would occur during the least-noise-sensitive portion of the day, and mitigation measures would reduce noise. It should be noted that while the construction activities could occur during a 15-year period when project buildout is anticipated to occur, impacts of construction activities at any one particular receptor would be affected for a much shorter duration (e.g., months at any one location), as construction impacts are localized and generally limited to receptors in the immediate vicinity of construction sites. Furthermore, construction of new residential and nonresidential land uses would depend on market conditions, resulting in intermittent construction activities within the Specific Plan area. Construction noise impacts would depend on the distance from the receptor to the location where individual construction activities (e.g., construction subphases) would occur and would also depend on the presence of intervening structures. Nonetheless, due to the length of construction activities and level of noise from the possible overlap of construction projects, Impact 5.9-4 would remain significant and unavoidable.
- **Impact 5.9-6:** The additional traffic plus a shift in the centerline of Chapman Avenue closer to the homes to the south would result in a substantial (+ 3dBA) increase in noise levels. The 6- to 8-foot-high masonry wall identified in Mitigation Measure 9-6 would offset the noise caused by additional traffic and

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

the additional lane on Chapman Avenue, and would provide a net decrease in noise levels at the nearest homes south of Chapman Avenue. Therefore, noise impacts would be less than significant. However, because implementation of a sound-wall along the frontage road has not yet been determined to be feasible, Impact 5.9-6 would be conservatively considered significant and unavoidable.

Transportation and Traffic

- **Impact 5.13-1:** Mitigation Measures have been identified to reduce project-level traffic impacts to the extent feasible. With mitigation, the proposed project would result in significant impacts at one study-area intersections and 17 freeway mainline segments. While improvements to SR-57 northbound ramps at Chapman Avenue are proposed, these improvements are outside of the City of Fullerton's jurisdictional control because the improvement would require approval from Caltrans who is the owner/operator of this intersection and required improvements under the freeway. Likewise, improvements to the 17 freeway mainline segments are also within the jurisdictional control of the Caltrans. Consequently, project-level traffic impacts under Impact 5.13-1 would remain significant and unavoidable.
- **Impact 5.13-2:** Mitigation Measures have been identified to reduce cumulative impacts to the extent feasible. For these improvements, applicants for development project would be required to contribute fair share fee as part of the City's Traffic Mitigation Fee Program. With mitigation, the proposed project would result in significant impacts at three study-area intersections and 17 freeway mainline segments. Improvements identified in the Transportation Impact Analysis Report were identified as infeasible due to physical constraints at State College Boulevard at Chapman Avenue. In addition, measures to the SR-57 ramps and SR-57 underpass are within the jurisdictional control of Caltrans and therefore, the City cannot guarantee implementation of the measures identified. Consequently, cumulative traffic impacts under Impact 5.13-2 would remain significant and unavoidable.

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

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

7.3.1 Alternative Development Areas

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project. The key question and first 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 any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR (Guidelines Sec. 15126[5][B][1]). In general, any development of the size and type proposed by the project would have substantially the same impacts on air quality, GHG emissions, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. Without a

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

site-specific analysis, impacts on aesthetics, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, and hydrology and water quality cannot be evaluated.

A key component of the proposed project is the connectivity of the project site with HIU and CSUF. Sites to the east are separated by SR-57, sites to the north are developed and are not near academic centers of the campus, and sites to the west are developed within single-family residential. The project site is currently proposed immediately south of the CSUF and HIU campuses and would provide direct connectivity needed to achieve the project objectives. Established residential neighborhoods exist further south of the project site and to the west and would essentially inhibit redevelopment of alternative sites.

The proposed project would provide much-needed student housing that would accommodate both HIU and CSUF. CSUF is currently considered a commuter campus. The proposed project would allow students to live in a shared community and college environment. As a result, the development of high-density residential units in another location would not offer the same reductions in vehicle trips and vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and the associated environmental benefits of reduced air quality, noise, and GHG emissions impacts. Land surrounding CSUF and HIU is built out with urban land uses. Therefore, no available alternative sites could meet the basic objectives established for the proposed project.

7.3.2 HIU “Googie” Dorm Alternative

This alternative would preserve the existing dorm buildings at HIU (601 and 651 Titan Drive) to ensure retention of the potentially historically significant buildings due to their association with Eldon C. Davis, a significant individual recognized for his “Googie” architectural design. The existing dormitory contains approximately 164 units. Buildout of the CollegeTown Specific Plan would result in 76 additional units within Planning Area 3 as well as additional institutional space for classrooms and other facilities (e.g., student cafeteria). Additional housing for HIU students would still be provided onsite in this alternative in order to ensure sufficient on-campus housing for HIU students.

In order to accommodate the additional residential and nonresidential densities proposed within the HIU campus, as well as the additional parking, major changes to the proposed circulation system would potentially be warranted, including elimination of the proposed transit hub as a result of retention of the dormitory building. Removal of the dormitory building would allow density to be concentrated within a smaller area of the HIU campus to allow for the additional parking and circulation of the CollegeTown Specific Plan. Furthermore, the HIU student dormitories were constructed in 1964 as a commercial structure (not as a residential structure). These buildings were constructed prior to the development of California’s Building and Energy Efficiency Standards and may not meet current standards for earthquake safety. With new technologies, the type of dormitory building needed is different from that constructed in 1964, and existing buildings are not sufficiently equipped to meet the high-tech needs of current college students. Furthermore, it is the desire to accommodate the demand for HIU student housing within Planning Area 3 in a more mixed-use setting. Because the proposed project retains the more significant of the two “Googie” structures and would only result in the elimination of the smaller dormitory building, this alternative was considered and rejected.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.4 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

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

- No Project Alternative
- No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative
- Existing Nutwood Avenue Configuration Alternative
- Underground Nutwood Avenue Alternative
- Reduced Intensity Alternative

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative, and where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify an environmentally superior development alternative. Each alternative's environmental impacts are compared to the proposed project and determined to be environmentally superior, neutral, or inferior. However, only 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. Only the impacts involving cultural resources (historic buildings), air quality, noise (construction only), and transportation and traffic were found to be significant and unavoidable. Section 7.10 identifies the environmentally superior alternative.

The CollegeTown Specific Plan is analyzed in detail in Chapter 5 of this DEIR.

7.4.1 Alternatives Comparison

The following statistical analyses provide a summary of general socioeconomic buildout projections of the alternatives, including the proposed project. The following statistics were developed as a tool to better understand the difference between the alternatives analyzed in the DEIR. Table 7-1 identifies information regarding dwelling units, population, nonresidential square footage, employment, and daily trip generation (without trip internalization) for each of the alternatives.

Table 7-1 Summary of Development Alternatives

Alternative	Description and Statistical Summary ¹	Basis for Selection and Summary of Analysis
Proposed Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Housing Units: 4,340 ■ Population: 13,888 ■ Nonresidential SQ FT: 1,371,900 ■ Employment: 3,103 ■ Trip Generation: 62,305 	NA
No Project Alternative	<p>This alternative would not result in changes to the existing land uses onsite.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Housing Units: 940 ■ Population: 1,817 ■ Nonresidential SQ FT: 701,380 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Required by CEQA ■ Avoids the need for an Amendment to The Fullerton Plan Roadway Classification Exhibit

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Table 7-1 Summary of Development Alternatives

Alternative	Description and Statistical Summary ¹	Basis for Selection and Summary of Analysis
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Employment: 1,437 ▪ Trip Generation: 29,501 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not reduce vehicle trips or vehicle miles traveled for students at HIU and CSUF ▪ Does not meet the project objectives
No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative	<p>This alternative would result in additional residential development within the CollegeTown site; however, development densities would be limited to those identified within The Fullerton Plan. In addition, no changes to Nutwood Avenue would be proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Housing Units: 813 ▪ Population: 2,602 ▪ Nonresidential SQ FT: 790,042 ▪ Employment: 1,913 ▪ Trip Generation: 30,392 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required by CEQA ▪ Avoids the need for an Amendment to The Fullerton Plan Roadway Classification Exhibit ▪ Does not meet the project objectives
Existing Nutwood Avenue Configuration Alternative	<p>This alternative would keep Nutwood Avenue open between Titan Drive and Folino Drive but would eliminate the Nutwood Plaza. Instead, a small mid-block pedestrian bridge would be constructed to alleviate pedestrian volumes crossing Nutwood Avenue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Housing Units: 4,340 ▪ Population: 13,888 ▪ Non-Residential SQFT: 1,371,900 ▪ Employment: 3,103 ▪ Trip Generation: 62,305 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoids the need for an Amendment to The Fullerton Plan Roadway Classification Exhibit ▪ Eliminates the direct project impact to Chapman Avenue but would continue to result in cumulative impacts. ▪ Does not fully meet the project objectives, including objectives regarding connectivity and creation of a new plaza
Underground Nutwood Avenue Alternative	<p>This alternative would underground Nutwood Avenue between Titan Drive and Folino Drive to avoid closure of Nutwood Avenue while still allowing for Nutwood Plaza.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Housing Units: 4,340 ▪ Population: 13,888 ▪ Nonresidential SQ FT: 1,371,900 ▪ Employment: 3,103 ▪ Trip Generation: 62,305 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoids the need for an Amendment to The Fullerton Plan Roadway Classification Exhibit ▪ Eliminates the direct project impact to Chapman Avenue but would continue to result in cumulative impacts. ▪ Meets the project objectives
Reduced Intensity Alternative	<p>This alternative would reduce housing intensity by 50 percent and reduce nonresidential intensity by 25 percent compared to the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Housing Units: 2,170 ▪ Population: 6,944 ▪ Nonresidential SQ FT: 1,028,925 ▪ Employment: 2,325 ▪ Trip Generation: 43,415 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduces significant traffic, air quality, and noise impacts ▪ Does not avoid significant environmental impacts ▪ Meets the most of the project objectives but not to the degree of the proposed project

Notes: Trip estimates do not include trip internalization.

SQFT: square feet; NA: Not Applicable

¹ Trip generation is based on raw ITE and does not include trip internalization.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.5 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative would prohibit all new development, restricting urban growth to its current extent. This alternative assumes that no additional development and growth within the CollegeTown Specific Plan would occur beyond what is already on the ground. Total population in the Specific Plan would be approximately 1,817 residents and employment would remain at existing levels, which is approximately 1,437 jobs. Development under this alternative would not increase residential densities and create a shared community and college environment. Table 7-2, *Buildout Statistical Summary of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Project*, shows the change in the land use statistics of this alternative compared to the proposed project.

Table 7-2 Buildout Statistical Comparison of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Project

Alternative	Housing Units	Population	Nonresidential SQ FT	Employment	Jobs/Housing Ratio	Trip Generation ¹
Proposed Project	4,340	13,888	1,371,900	3,103	0.71	62,305
No Project Alternative	940	1,817	701,380	1,437	1.53	29,501
Change	-3,400	-12,071	-670,520	-1,666	0.81	-32,804
Percent Change	-78%	-87%	-49%	-54%	114%	-53%

Notes: SQ FT: square feet

¹ Trip generation is based on raw ITE and does not include trip internalization.

7.5.1 Aesthetics

The No Project Alternative would not cause any changes to the visual character of the project site, its surroundings, and adjoining land. No changes in the sources of light and glare onsite would occur. No structures would be demolished—including the potentially historically significant structures at 601 and 651 Titan Drive on the HIU campus—and no new structures would be built. This alternative would also not create any aesthetic improvements to the project site (e.g., many existing buildings onsite are several decades old and need renovation). Overall, aesthetics impacts would be neutral between this alternative and the proposed project.

7.5.2 Air Quality

This alternative would not exceed the growth assumptions in The Fullerton Plan. These growth assumptions are incorporated into SCAQMD's AQMP. This alternative would not generate an increase in criteria pollutant emissions because no construction activities would occur and no changes in land use would be implemented. While this alternative would not expose new residents near SR-57 to elevated pollutant concentrations, there is an existing apartment complex proximate to SR-57 that is subject to elevated concentrations of particulate matter and toxic air contaminants (TACs). High-efficiency MERV filters would not be installed in these existing units. The No Project Alternative would also not reduce vehicle trips per service population as much as the proposed project (as identified by the MXD model) through the development of livable streets that cater to pedestrians and bicyclists, and by creating a seamless learning, living, working, shopping, dining, and recreation environment for students from the two universities as well as people from the surrounding

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

community. While this alternative does not have the benefits of a mixed use project, it would not generate air pollutant emissions and therefore air quality impacts would be less than significant under this alternative. This alternative would eliminate the project's significant unavoidable air quality impacts.

7.5.3 Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would not remove or alter any potentially historical buildings. This alternative would not involve ground disturbance and so would not impact archaeological or paleontological resources that could be buried in site soils. Cultural resources impacts would be less than significant under this alternative and would eliminate the project's significant impact from removal of the potentially historic building complex at 601 and 651 Titan Drive.

7.5.4 Geology and Soils

This alternative would not develop new buildings onsite. Many buildings onsite were built before current seismic safety codes; thus, this alternative, by retaining older buildings onsite, could expose people to greater hazards from strong ground shaking. Geologic hazards impacts of this alternative would be neutral to those of the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7.5.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This alternative would not generate an increase in GHG emissions because no construction activities would occur and no changes in land use would be implemented. This alternative would have a lower magnitude of GHG emissions than the proposed project. However, the proposed project would reduce GHG emissions per capita in 2030 by two-thirds of current emissions, to 4.6 metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent (MTCO_{2e}) per service population (SP), just below SCAQMD's efficiency metric of 4.8 MTCO_{2e}/SP. However, this alternative would not generate an increase in GHG emissions and therefore would have less than significant impacts.

7.5.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would not use hazardous materials in construction onsite; would not disturb hazardous materials through demolition onsite; and would not introduce new uses of hazardous materials in operation of land uses onsite. Hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be reduced by this alternative and would be less than significant.

7.5.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would not introduce new sources of water pollutants to the site. However, this alternative also would not develop new low-impact development (LID), source control, site design, and treatment control best management practices (BMPs) to minimize runoff and water pollution. This alternative would not decrease runoff flows into storm drainage systems, as would buildout of the proposed Specific Plan. Hydrology and water quality impacts would be increased by this alternative, and would be less than significant without mitigation for the proposed project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.5.8 Land Use and Planning

This alternative would not redevelop the site with a mix of land uses. This alternative would also not require an amendment to The Fullerton Plan. Land use and planning impacts would be reduced by this alternative, and would be less than significant.

7.5.9 Noise

This alternative would not generate an increase in ambient noise levels because no construction activities would occur and no changes in land use would be implemented. This alternative would not generate construction noise; would not increase traffic noise due to increased vehicle trips on area roadways; and would not increase noise from stationary sources onsite such as building heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. The No Project Alternative would not reduce vehicle trips per service population by developing livable streets that cater to pedestrians and bicyclists, and by creating a seamless learning, living, working, shopping, dining, and recreation environment for students from the two universities as well as people from the surrounding community. Overall, noise impacts would be reduced by this alternative and would be less than significant. Because this alternative would not result in construction noise, this alternative would eliminate the project's significant construction noise impact.

7.5.10 Population and Housing

This alternative would not add an estimated net 12,071 residents and 1,666 workers to the project site. This alternative would not temporarily displace site residents through redevelopment. Note that Specific Plan buildout would increase the total number of housing units onsite, and thus is not expected to have a net long-term adverse impact by displacing residents. Population and housing impacts would be reduced by this alternative, and would be less than significant.

7.5.11 Public Services

This alternative would not increase population, employment, or land use intensity onsite, and thus would not create increased demand for public services. Public services impacts would be reduced by this alternative, and would be less than significant.

7.5.12 Recreation

The No Project Alternative would not increase population onsite, and thus would not increase demand for parks; and would not develop parks. This alternative would reduce impacts to parks, and impacts would be less than significant.

7.5.13 Transportation and Traffic

This alternative would not generate new vehicle, bicycle, or pedestrian trips. This alternative would not reconfigure roadways in the project site, including Nutwood Avenue and Commonwealth Avenue, and would not require partial closure of Nutwood Avenue between Titan to Folino Drive, which requires an amendment

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

to the Orange County Transportation Authority's (OCTA) Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH). Transportation and traffic impacts would be reduced by this alternative because no new trips would be generated and this alternative would not result in partial closure of Nutwood Avenue. Impacts would be less than significant. This alternative would eliminate the significant unavoidable impact to local facilities and Caltrans facilities.

7.5.14 Utilities and Service Systems

This alternative would not increase population or employment onsite, and thus would not create increased demands for utilities and service systems. This alternative would also not install the water, sewer, and storm drainage improvements the proposed project would install. Although runoff to drainage systems would be increased by this alternative compared to the proposed project because the existing land uses have more impermeable surfaces, utilities impacts would be reduced by this alternative and would be less than significant.

7.5.15 Conclusion

Ability to Reduce Project Impacts

This alternative would reduce impacts to cultural resources, air quality, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems compared to the proposed Specific Plan. This alternative would eliminate the project's significant unavoidable impacts to historic resources, air quality, construction noise, and transportation and traffic. This alternative would increase impacts to hydrology and water quality, including drainage systems.

Ability to Achieve the Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the project objectives. This alternative would not generate a mixed-use environment with a mix of retail services, entertainment, office, and urban housing. This alternative would not integrate CSUF and HIU programs, housing, and services into a shared community and college environment. This alternative would not create livable streets that cater to pedestrians and bicyclists and would not be conveniently accessible by bus, streetcar, and local shuttle from Metrolink stations and other activity centers. No enhancements to the county bike path on Commonwealth would be implemented under this alternative. This alternative would also not reduce commuting and extend students' stay in Fullerton by creating opportunities for congregating, socializing, recreating, and living. Under this alternative, the creation of the Nutwood Plaza would not be implemented, and therefore this alternative would not create a meeting place for students and faculty at CSUF and HIU and would not improve pedestrian safety.

7.6 NO PROJECT/EXISTING GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would build out the CollegeTown site as identified in The Fullerton Plan (see Table 7-3). This alternative would result in no additional residential growth within the CollegeTown Specific Plan but would accommodate more commercial and office space. Planning Area 3 would be redeveloped with additional

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

office use. Other existing commercial and office uses in Planning Areas 4, 5, 6, and 7 would be redeveloped with commercial and/or office uses to the maximum development intensities allowed under The Fullerton Plan. Residential and institutional land uses in Planning Areas 1 and 2 would not be redeveloped in this alternative. Under this alternative, no changes to Nutwood Avenue would be proposed, and internal circulation would be similar to the current conditions.

Table 7-3 Buildout Statistical Comparison of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative to the Proposed Project

Alternative	Housing Units	Population	Nonresidential SQFT	Employment	Jobs/Housing Ratio	Trip Generation ¹
Proposed Project	4,340	13,888	1,371,900	3,101	0.71	62,305
No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative	813	2,602	790,042	1,913	2.35	30,392
Change	-3,527	-11,286	-581,858	-1,190	1.64	-31,913
Percent Change	-81%	-81%	-42%	-38%	229%	-51%

Note: SQFT: square feet

¹ Trip generation is based on raw ITE and does not include trip internalization.

7.6.1 Aesthetics

The number of existing buildings demolished and the amount of new construction would be reduced in this alternative. Redevelopment would generally occur in the nonresidential portions of Planning Areas 3 through 7, rather than the entire site. This alternative would not result in partial closure of Nutwood Avenue between Titan and Folino Drive. Potentially historic buildings at 601 and 651 Titan Drive on the HIU campus would not be demolished, and there would not be an increase in the number of residential units onsite. This alternative would result in aesthetic improvements on portions of the CollegeTown site. Aesthetics impacts would be neutral for this alternative compared to the proposed project, and would be less than significant.

7.6.2 Air Quality

This alternative would not exceed the growth assumptions in The Fullerton Plan, which are incorporated into SCAQMD's AQMP. While this alternative would generate an increase in criteria pollutant emissions from construction activities and land use changes, the increase in emissions would be substantially less than the increase generated under the proposed project. Due to the minimal growth identified in The Fullerton Plan for the CollegeTown site, it is likely that construction and operational emissions under this alternative would be less than significant with mitigation. This alternative would not expose new residents near SR-57 to elevated pollutant concentrations. This alternative would also not reduce vehicle trips per service population as much as the proposed project as identified by the MXD model. This alternative would reduce operational emissions of the proposed project contributing to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Air quality impacts would be reduced to less than significant after mitigation in this alternative and would eliminate the significant and unavoidable air quality impact of the proposed project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.6.3 Cultural Resources

This alternative would not demolish potentially historic buildings at 601 and 651 Titan Drive on the HIU campus. Ground disturbance would be reduced in this alternative, since parts of Planning Areas 3 through 7 would be redeveloped rather than the entire site. Thus, potential impacts to buried archaeological and paleontological resources would be reduced. Cultural resources impacts would be less than significant and would eliminate the significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project.

7.6.4 Geology and Soils

This alternative would reduce the numbers of residents and workers that could be exposed to geologic hazards onsite. Future redevelopments would require geotechnical investigations and compliance with their recommendations, as would the proposed project. However, this alternative would also leave a number of decades-old residential buildings in place that were built before current seismic safety codes; residential redevelopment onsite by the proposed project would have some favorable impact on seismic safety. Overall, geology and soils impacts would be similar to the proposed project and less than significant, as they would be for the proposed project.

7.6.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This alternative would generate an increase in GHG emissions from construction activities and land use changes; however, the increase in emissions would be substantially less than the increase generated under the proposed project. GHG emissions impacts would be reduced in this alternative by the 51 percent reduction in trip generation compared to the proposed project, and reduction in land use intensity (81 percent decrease in residential units and 42 percent decrease in nonresidential building area). GHG emissions impacts would be less than significant.

7.6.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would reduce the amount of future commercial and office land uses that could use hazardous materials. This alternative would also reduce the number of existing buildings that could be demolished for redevelopment, thus reducing potential exposure to existing hazardous materials onsite, such as asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint. Future projects in this alternative would be required to conduct Phase I Environmental Site Assessments for sites identified in Section 5.6, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, and to carry out any needed cleanup work specified in the Phase I assessments. Overall, hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be reduced for this alternative and would be less than significant.

7.6.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would reduce the portion of the site that would be redeveloped, since only parts of the sites of Planning Areas 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 would be redeveloped. Thus, this alternative would not decrease impervious areas onsite as much as the proposed project, and it would not install as much drainage and water quality improvements as the proposed project. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts would be neutral for this alternative compared to those of the proposed project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.6.8 Land Use and Planning

This alternative would not redevelop the site with a mix of residential and nonresidential land uses to the extent of the proposed project. This alternative would also not require an amendment to The Fullerton Plan. Land use and planning impacts would be reduced by this alternative and would be less than significant.

7.6.9 Noise

This alternative would result in construction noise and an increase in noise from an increase in nonresidential land use intensity in portions of the site. However, this alternative would generate less noise from construction, traffic, and stationary sources than would the proposed project. While this alternative would reduce overall noise from project-generated traffic, it would not reduce vehicle trips per service population to the same extent as the proposed project (as identified in the MXD model) would by developing livable streets that cater to pedestrians and bicyclists and by creating a seamless learning, living, working, shopping, dining, and recreating environment for students from the two universities as well as people from the surrounding community. Overall, noise impacts would be reduced by this alternative. However, because construction noise would occur near to noise-sensitive land uses, construction impacts would be significant.

7.6.10 Population and Housing

This alternative would increase population and housing impacts. While no residents would be temporarily displaced in this alternative, this alternative would develop fewer housing units available to CSUF and HIU students. The jobs-housing ratio of this alternative, 2.35, would worsen the existing jobs-rich jobs-housing ratio of the City of Fullerton. However, impacts would be less than significant.

7.6.11 Public Services

This alternative would reduce project-generated public services demands compared to the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

7.6.12 Recreation

Project-generated demands for parks would be reduced in this scenario due to the 81 percent reduction in both residential units and population at buildout. Impacts would be less than significant.

7.6.13 Transportation and Traffic

This impact would reduce trip generation by 51 percent compared to the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would not require partial closure of Nutwood Avenue between Titan and Folino Drive. Many of the project improvements are triggered by partial closure of Nutwood Avenue or at 75 percent of the total increase in trip generation of the project. Because this alternative would reduce trips by over 50 percent, this alternative would eliminate the significant unavoidable traffic impacts of the project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.6.14 Utilities and Service Systems

This alternative would reduce project utilities demands due to the reduced numbers of residential units, residents, nonresidential building square feet, and employees. This alternative would install fewer water, sewer, and drainage improvements than the proposed project would, and only in the sites of Planning Areas 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. Utilities impacts would be less than significant.

7.6.15 Conclusion

Ability to Reduce Project Impacts

This alternative would reduce impacts to cultural resources, air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, GHG emissions, land use and planning, noise, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems, compared to impacts of the proposed project. Significant and unavoidable cultural resources, air quality, and traffic impacts of the proposed project would be reduced to less than significant under this alternative. Impacts of this alternative to aesthetics, geology and soils, and hydrology and water quality would be neutral to those of the proposed project. This alternative would increase impacts to population and housing.

Ability to Achieve the Project Objectives

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not achieve most of the project objectives. This alternative would not implement the standards, guidelines, and regulating code of the CollegeTown Specific Plan, and thus would not redevelop the site with development standards; landscaping design standards; and vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation improvements for the entire site. This alternative would not achieve objectives related to increasing housing available to CSUF and HIU students next to those two campuses because no new residential development would occur under this alternative. This alternative would also not create livable streets that cater to pedestrians and bicyclists or reduce commuting by students at CSUF and HIU. This alternative would also not result in partial closure of Nutwood Avenue and would therefore not result in the creation of Nutwood Plaza and the proposed transit hub in Nutwood Plaza, which would integrate CSUF and HIU programs, housing, and services into a shared community and college environment, creating a seamless learning, living, working, shopping, dining, and recreating environment for the whole Fullerton community and maximizing joint-development between the universities and private partners for student parking, housing, or other facilities.

7.7 EXISTING NUTWOOD AVENUE CONFIGURATION ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would keep Nutwood Avenue open between Titan Drive and Folino Drive but would eliminate Nutwood Plaza. Instead, a small midblock pedestrian bridge would be constructed to alleviate pedestrian volumes crossing Nutwood Avenue. Buildout of this alternative would be the same as the proposed project and would result in the development of 4,340 housing units, resulting in a population of 13,888 people, and would develop 1,371,900 square feet of nonresidential development, resulting in approximately 3,103 employees within the CollegeTown Specific Plan.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.7.1 Aesthetics

This alternative would have the same impacts to visual character of the site and surroundings, light, and glare as the proposed project, except that Nutwood Plaza would be deleted in favor of a pedestrian bridge over Nutwood Avenue linking the project site with the CSUF campus. Aesthetic impacts of this alternative would be slightly greater due to the deletion of Nutwood Plaza, which would have a favorable aesthetic impact to the site.

7.7.2 Air Quality

Leaving Nutwood Avenue open along the north site boundary would not affect trip generation or vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and thus would not affect operational vehicle emissions within the SoCAB air basin, as compared to the proposed project. This alternative would involve the same construction effort, with the exception of the demolition of Nutwood Avenue, and so construction emissions would be similar to the proposed project. This alternative would also result in similar air quality land use compatibility impacts from proximity to SR-57. Air quality impacts would be neutral compared to the proposed project, and would be significant and unavoidable.

7.7.3 Cultural Resources

Cultural resources impacts of this alternative would be the same as those of the proposed project. Excavations for the piers of the pedestrian bridge would be minor compared to those for grading and construction of the buildings that would be developed pursuant to the Specific Plan. Thus, impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources after mitigation would be the same for this alternative as for the proposed project. Potentially historic buildings at 601 and 651 Titan Drive would be demolished and would result in a significant impact. This alternative would have the same impacts on historic resources as would the proposed project.

7.7.4 Geology and Soils

This alternative would develop the same buildings and would be occupied by the same numbers of residents and workers as would the proposed project. The same numbers of people would potentially be exposed to geologic hazards by this alternative as by the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

7.7.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This alternative would have the same GHG emissions impacts as the proposed project. Replacement of Nutwood Plaza in the proposed project with the pedestrian bridge in this alternative is not expected to impact the number of people walking between the CSUF campus and the project site, compared to the numbers of people who would drive between the two locations. GHG impacts would be neutral compared to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.7.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would involve the same construction and operational uses of hazardous materials as would the proposed project and would involve the same potential exposures to existing hazardous materials onsite, such as asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint. Hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be similar compared to the proposed project.

7.7.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would involve the same reduction in impervious areas and would develop the same storm drainage and water quality improvements as would the proposed project. Development of the pedestrian bridge in this alternative would not impact hydrology or water quality. Therefore, hydrology and water quality impacts would be similar to the proposed project.

7.7.8 Land Use and Planning

This alternative would not require an amendment to the City of Fullerton's The Fullerton Plan Roadway Classification or an MPAH amendment, as the proposed project would. Thus, land use and planning impacts of this alternative would be slightly reduced by this alternative. However, this alternative would still require amendments to the General Plan and Zoning to implement the land use and circulation changes associated with the project. However, like the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant.

7.7.9 Noise

This alternative would generate similar construction and operational noise impacts associated with project-related vehicle trips, construction, and stationary sources as the proposed project. Widening of Chapman Avenue would still be required and this alternative would include installation of the noise wall that would reduce existing noise levels at receptors along the Chapman frontage road. Noise impacts would be neutral compared to the proposed project. Construction noise would result in a significant noise impact.

7.7.10 Population and Housing

This alternative would develop the same number of housing units, the same amount of employment-generating land uses, and would temporarily displace the same number of existing residents as the proposed project would. Population and housing impacts would be the same as the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7.7.11 Public Services

This alternative would generate the same public services demands as would the proposed project: because it would accommodate the same numbers of residents and workers and would consist of the same land use intensity. Impacts would be the same as the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.7.12 Recreation

This alternative would create the same demand for parks as the proposed project. However, this alternative would not result in the creation of the Nutwood Plaza. Consequently, recreational impacts of this alternative would be met but to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Impacts would be slightly greater than the proposed project but would be less than significant.

7.7.13 Transportation and Traffic

This impact would generate the same amount of morning, evening, and daily trips as the proposed project. However, this alternative would not require partial closure of Nutwood Avenue between Titan and Folino Drive. Many of the project improvements are triggered by partial closure of Nutwood Avenue or at 75 percent of the total increase in trip generation of the project. Because this alternative would not reduce trips, it would have significant unavoidable traffic impacts. Impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed project but would be significant.

7.7.14 Utilities and Service Systems

This alternative would generate the same utilities demands as the proposed project. It would accommodate the same numbers of residents and workers and would consist of the same land use intensity. This alternative would install the same water, sewer, and drainage improvements as the proposed project. Impacts would be similar compared to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7.7.15 Conclusion

Ability to Reduce Project Impacts

This alternative would reduce project impacts to land use and planning and transportation and traffic. Impacts of this alternative on cultural resources, air quality, geology and soils, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, population and housing, public services, and utilities and service systems would be similar to those of the proposed project. This alternative would result in slightly greater impacts to aesthetics and recreation because Nutwood Avenue would remain open.

Ability to Achieve the Project Objectives

This alternative would not meet project objectives relating to the creation of Nutwood Plaza. This alternative would not create a new landscape plaza, close a segment of Nutwood Avenue to allow for safe crossing of pedestrians and bicyclists, or provide a central location for community/campus events and everyday outdoor enjoyment. This alternative would also not create a meeting place for the students and faculty from all Fullerton institutions of higher learning. This alternative would meet several other project objectives, but to a lesser degree than the proposed project, including: integration of the CSUF and HIU programs, housing, and services into a shared community and college environment; creation of a seamless learning, living, working, shopping, dining, and recreating environment for the whole Fullerton community; and reducing commuting

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

and extend students' stay in Fullerton by creating opportunities for congregating, socializing, recreating, and living.

7.8 UNDERGROUND NUTWOOD AVENUE ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would underground Nutwood Avenue between Titan Drive and Folino Drive to avoid closure of Nutwood Avenue while still allowing the creation of Nutwood Plaza. Buildout of this alternative would be the same as the proposed project and would result in the development of 4,340 housing units, resulting in a population of 13,888 people, and would develop 1,371,900 square feet of nonresidential development, resulting in approximately 3,103 employees within the CollegeTown Specific Plan.

To create the Nutwood Plaza, utilities within the Nutwood Avenue right-of-way would be relocated, including stormwater, sewer, water, and dry utilities. Stormwater management would require an active system during storm events to pump stormwater within the below-ground tunnel to ensure no flooding within the tunnel would occur. Construction of the tunnel would require temporary closure of Nutwood Avenue. Depending on the duration of this closure, Chapman Avenue and the SR-57 ramps at Chapman Avenue would experience an increase in traffic volumes as traffic is rerouted.

7.8.1 Aesthetics

This alternative would have the same impacts to visual character of the site and surroundings, light, and glare as the proposed project, except that Nutwood Avenue would be undergrounded below Nutwood Plaza. Impacts would be less than significant.

7.8.2 Air Quality

Leaving Nutwood Avenue open along the north site boundary would not affect trip generation or VMT and thus would not affect operational vehicle emissions, compared to the proposed project. This alternative would involve a similar construction effort but would require substantially more construction effort to underground Nutwood Avenue. Construction emissions would be slightly higher compared to the proposed project. This alternative would also result in similar air quality land use compatibility impacts from proximity to SR-57. Air quality impacts would be significant.

7.8.3 Cultural Resources

Cultural resources impacts of this alternative would be greater than those of the proposed project. Excavation for undergrounding of Nutwood Avenue in this alternative would extend about 20 feet deeper than excavation for Nutwood Plaza in the proposed project. Thus, impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources would be greater for this alternative than for the proposed project but would be less than significant. This alternative would result in the demolition of potentially historic buildings at 601 and 651 Titan Drive and would have the same impacts on historic resources as the proposed project. Impacts would be significant.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.8.4 Geology and Soils

Development of this alternative would result in similar land use changes within the CollegeTown site. The same number of people would potentially be exposed to geologic hazards by this alternative as by the proposed project. The geotechnical investigation that would be done for this alternative would include sampling and testing of soil samples from the site of undergrounding of Nutwood Avenue, and recommendations for construction of the underground roadway and the overlying Nutwood Plaza. Impacts would be similar compared to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7.8.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This alternative would have the same GHG emissions impacts as would the proposed project. Undergrounding of Nutwood Avenue in this alternative is not expected to impact the number of people walking between the CSUF campus and the project site, compared to the number of people who would drive between the two locations. GHG impacts would be neutral compared to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7.8.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would involve the same construction and operational uses of hazardous materials as would the proposed project, and would involve the same potential exposures to existing hazardous materials onsite, such as asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint. Hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be similar compared to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7.8.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would involve the same reduction in impervious areas and would develop the same water quality improvements and most of the same storm drainage as would the proposed project. Undergrounding of a segment of Nutwood Avenue would require relocation of existing storm drains in Nutwood Avenue, and installation and occasional use of pumps to pump stormwater out of the underground segment of Nutwood Avenue. Hydrology and water quality impacts would be slightly greater because of the additional infrastructure needed in the subterranean portions of the Nutwood Avenue alignment, but would be less than significant.

7.8.8 Land Use and Planning

This alternative would not require an amendment to the City of Fullerton's The Fullerton Plan Roadway Classification, as the proposed project would. Thus, land use and planning impacts of this alternative would be slightly reduced by this alternative. However, this alternative would still require amendments to the General Plan and Zoning to implement the land use and circulation changes associated with the project. Like the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.8.9 Noise

This alternative would generate the same noise levels from project-related vehicle trips and stationary sources as would the proposed project. Widening of Chapman Avenue would still be required and this alternative would include installation of the noise wall that would reduce existing noise levels at receptors along the Chapman frontage road. Operational noise impacts would be neutral compared to the proposed project. Construction activities associated with the undergrounding of Nutwood Avenue would result in a slightly longer construction time frame associated with this component. Construction noise impacts would be similar to the proposed project and would be significant.

7.8.10 Population and Housing

This alternative would develop the same number of housing units, the same amount of employment-generating land uses, and would temporarily displace the same number of existing residents as the proposed project. Population and housing impacts would be the same as the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7.8.11 Public Services

This alternative would generate the same public services demands as would the proposed project. This alternative would accommodate the same numbers of residents and workers and would consist of the same land use intensity. Impacts would be similar to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7.8.12 Recreation

This alternative would create the same demand for parks and would develop the same park acreage and amenities as the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would allow the creation of the Nutwood Avenue Plaza through undergrounding Nutwood Avenue. Impacts would be similar compared to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7.8.13 Transportation and Traffic

This impact would generate the same amount of morning, evening, and daily trips as the proposed project. However, this alternative would not require partial closure of Nutwood Avenue between Titan and Folino Drive. Many of the project improvements are triggered by partial closure of Nutwood Avenue or at 75 percent of the total increase in trip generation of the project. Because this alternative would not reduce trips, this alternative would have significant unavoidable traffic impacts. Impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed project but would be significant.

7.8.14 Utilities and Service Systems

This alternative would generate the same utilities demands as would the proposed project. This alternative would accommodate the same numbers of residents and workers, and would consist of the same land use intensity. Impacts would be similar to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.8.15 Conclusion

Ability to Reduce Project Impacts

This alternative would slightly reduce project impacts to land use and planning and transportation and traffic. Impacts of this alternative on aesthetics, cultural resources, geology and soils, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems would be similar to those of the proposed project. Construction-related noise and air quality impacts would be slightly increased compared to the proposed project and would be significant, like the proposed project. Hydrology and water quality impacts would be slightly greater but would be less than significant.

Ability to Achieve the Project Objectives

This alternative would achieve all of the project objectives to the same degree the proposed project.

7.9 REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

A reduced intensity alternative was considered to reduce the significant traffic, air quality, and noise impacts of the proposed project. This alternative would reduce housing intensity by 50 percent and reduce nonresidential intensity by 25 percent compared to the project. Buildout of this alternative would result in the development of 2,170 housing units, resulting in a population of 6,944 people, and would develop 1,028,925 square feet of nonresidential development, resulting in approximately 2,325 employees within the CollegeTown Specific Plan. Table 7-4, *Buildout Statistical Comparison of the Reduced Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Project*, shows the change in the land use statistics of this alternative compared to the proposed project.

Table 7-4 Buildout Statistical Summary of the Reduced Intensity Alternative to the Proposed Project

Alternative	Housing Units	Population	Nonresidential SQ FT	Employment	Jobs/Housing Ratio	Trip Generation ¹
Proposed Project	4,340	13,888	1,371,900	3,103	0.71	62,305
Reduced Intensity Alternative	2,170	6,944	1,028,925	2,325	1.07	43,415
Change	-2,170	-6,944	-342,975	-778	0.36	-18,890
Percent Change	-50%	-50%	-25%	-25%	+50%	-30%

Note: SQFT: square feet

¹ Trip generation is based on raw ITE and does not include trip internalization.

7.9.1 Aesthetics

This alternative would redevelop the same portion of the project site as the proposed project, albeit with reduced intensity. Building heights, especially of residential buildings, would be lower in this alternative than in the proposed project. The reduction in building heights in this alternative would have neutral impacts on the visual character of the site or its surroundings. Aesthetics impacts of this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.9.2 Air Quality

This alternative would reduce operational emissions by approximately 30 percent compared to the proposed project due to a 30 percent decrease in trip generation. The increase in residential and nonresidential intensity would be greater than that identified in The Fullerton Plan. Construction emissions would be slightly reduced in this alternative due to the above-stated decreases in development intensity. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would not reduce vehicle trips per service population as much as the proposed project, as identified by the MXD model. Construction and operational air quality impacts would remain significant. This alternative would also result in similar air quality land use compatibility impacts from proximity to SR-57. Impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would be significant.

7.9.3 Cultural Resources

Cultural resources impacts would be the same for this alternative as for the proposed project. The potentially historic buildings at 601 and 651 Titan Drive would be demolished in this alternative. While building heights in this alternative would be somewhat lower than in the proposed project, it is conservatively assumed that grading and excavation depths would be the same. Impacts would be the same as the proposed project, and impacts to the potentially historic buildings would be significant.

7.9.4 Geology and Soils

Development of this alternative would result in similar land use changes within the CollegeTown site. Geology and soils impacts would be similar to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7.9.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions compared to existing conditions. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would reduce GHG emissions by approximately 30 percent due to reduced development intensity. However, this alternative would not reduce GHG emissions per capita as much as the proposed project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would not reduce vehicle trips per service population as much as the proposed project, as identified by the MXD model. This alternative is assumed not to achieve the GHG efficiency metric. Consequently, this alternative would result in a significant GHG emissions impact.

7.9.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would involve the same construction and operational uses of hazardous materials as the proposed project, albeit with a 25 percent reduction in nonresidential land use intensity. This alternative would involve the same potential exposures to existing hazardous materials onsite, such as asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint. Such potential exposures would occur during construction of projects, not operation, and the numbers of residents and operations-phase workers who could be exposed would be the same as for the proposed project. Hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be similar to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.9.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would create the same increase in pervious areas and install the same drainage and water quality features as the proposed project. Impacts would be the same compared to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7.9.8 Land Use and Planning

Land use and planning impacts of this alternative would be the same as for the proposed project. Each scenario would require an amendment to The Fullerton Plan Roadway Classification permitting closure of a segment of Nutwood Avenue. Impacts would be the same and would be less than significant.

7.9.9 Noise

This alternative would result in construction noise and an increase in noise from an increase in residential and nonresidential land use intensity within the CollegeTown site. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would slightly reduce operational noise impacts of the project and would be less than significant. Development of this alternative would result in similar land use changes within the CollegeTown site; therefore, construction noise impacts would be similar. Construction noise impacts would be significant.

7.9.10 Population and Housing

This alternative at buildout would house half the population of the proposed project and would result in a 25 percent decrease in employment. The City's jobs-housing ratio at project buildout would be very slightly more jobs-rich in this alternative than for the proposed project due to the greater reduction in residential development versus nonresidential development in this alternative. Population and housing impacts of this alternative would be slightly greater than those of the proposed project due to the slightly increased adverse impact on jobs-housing balance. Impacts would be less than significant.

7.9.11 Public Services

Public services demands due to buildout of this alternative would be reduced compared to those for the proposed project due to the 50 percent reduction in buildout population and 25 percent reduction in buildout employment. Impacts would be less than significant.

7.9.12 Recreation

This alternative would not result in as high of a demand for parks as the proposed project due to the reduced residential and nonresidential development. Impacts would be reduced by this alternative and would be less than significant.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.9.13 Transportation and Traffic

This alternative would reduce project trip generation by 30 percent compared to the proposed project. This alternative would also result in the partial closure of Nutwood Avenue between Titan and Folino Drive. Many of the project improvements are triggered by partial closure of Nutwood Avenue or at 75 percent of the total increase in trip generation of the project. Impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed project but would be significant.

7.9.14 Utilities and Service Systems

Utilities and service systems demands would be less than for the proposed project due to the 50 percent reduction in buildout population and 25 percent reduction in buildout employment. Utilities and service systems impacts would be slightly less compared to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

7.9.15 Conclusion

Ability to Reduce Project Impacts

This alternative would reduce impacts to air quality, noise (operational), public services, recreation, utilities and service systems, and transportation and traffic. This alternative would reduce but would not eliminate the significant air quality and transportation and traffic impacts of the project. Impacts of this alternative to aesthetics, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, noise (construction), and hydrology and water quality would be neutral to those of the proposed project. This alternative would result in slightly greater GHG and population and housing impacts. This alternative would result in a new significant impact to GHG emissions.

Ability to Achieve the Project Objectives

This alternative would achieve all of the objectives of the proposed project. However, this alternative would achieve objectives regarding providing housing, especially housing for students, to a much lower degree due to the 50 percent reduction in residential units. This alternative also would achieve objectives regarding provision of a mix of nonresidential land uses, in addition to residential land uses, to a lower degree than the proposed project due to the 25 percent reduction in nonresidential land uses.

7.10 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires a lead agency to identify the “environmentally superior alternative,” and in cases where the “No Project” Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project, the environmentally superior development alternative must be identified. A summary of the impacts of the alternatives compared to the proposed project is in Table 7-5. A summary of the ability of the alternatives to achieve the objectives of the project is in Table 7-6. One alternative has been identified as “environmentally superior” to the proposed project:

- No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Table 7-5 Summary of Impacts of Alternatives Compared to the Proposed Project

Topic	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	No Project/ Existing General Plan Alternative	Existing Nutwood Avenue Configuration Alternative	Underground Nutwood Avenue Alternative	Reduced Intensity Alternative
Aesthetics	LTS	(=)	(=)	(+)	(=)	(=)
Air Quality						
Construction	SU	(--)	(--)	(=)	(+)	(-)
Operation	SU	(--)	(--)	(=)	(=)	(-)
Cultural Resources	SU	(--)	(--)	(=)	(=)	(=)
Geology and Soils	LTS	(=)	(=)	(=)	(=)	(=)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LTS	(-)	(-)	(=)	(=)	(++)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LTS	(-)	(-)	(=)	(=)	(=)
Hydrology and Water Quality	LTS	(+)	(=)	(=)	(+)	(=)
Land Use and Planning	LTS	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(=)
Noise						
Construction	SU	(--)	(-)	(=)	(+)	(=)
Operation	LTS	(-)	(-)	(=)	(=)	(-)
Population and Housing	LTS	(-)	(+)	(=)	(=)	(+)
Public Services	LTS	(-)	(-)	(=)	(=)	(-)
Recreation	LTS	(-)	(-)	(+)	(=)	(-)
Transportation/ Traffic	SU	(--)	(--)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Utilities and Service Systems	LTS	(-)	(-)	(=)	(=)	(-)

Notes: LTS: Less than Significant; SU: Significant and Unavoidable

(-) The alternative would result in less of an impact than the proposed project.

(--) The alternative would result in less of an impact than the proposed project and would eliminate a significant impact.

(+) The alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed project.

(++) The alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed project and result in a new significant impact

(=) The alternative would result in the same/similar impacts as the proposed project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Table 7-6 Ability of Each Alternative to Meet the Project Objectives

Project Objective	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	No Project / Existing General Plan Alternative	Existing Nutwood Avenue Configuration Alternative	Underground Nutwood Avenue Alternative	Reduced Intensity Alternative
Attract the right mix of retail services, entertainment, office, and urban housing that appeals to students and the greater community.	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent
Integrate California State University of Fullerton and Hope International University programs, housing, and services into a shared community and college environment.	Yes	No	No	Yes, but not to the same extent	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent
Create livable streets that cater to pedestrians and bicyclists. Preserve and enhance existing county bike path on Commonwealth Avenue.	Yes	No	No	Yes, but not to the same extent	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent
Be conveniently accessible by bus, streetcar, and local shuttle from Metrolink stations and other activity centers.	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent
Reduce commuting and extend students' stay in Fullerton by creating opportunities for congregating, socializing, recreating, and living.	Yes	No	No	Yes, but not to the same extent	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent
Create a seamless learning, living, working, shopping, dining, and recreating environment for the whole Fullerton community.	Yes	No	No	Yes, but not to the same extent	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent
Create a high quality, year-round activities calendar that complements other programming in the City and strengthens the area's economic development potential.	Yes	No	No	Yes, but not to the same extent	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent
Create a destination identity that attracts the surrounding communities and the larger Orange County area.	Yes	No	No	Yes, but not to the same extent	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent
Create a meeting place for the students and faculty from all Fullerton institutions of higher learning.	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent
Maximize joint-development between the universities and private partners for student parking, housing, or other facilities.	Yes	No	No	Yes, but not to the same extent	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Table 7-6 Ability of Each Alternative to Meet the Project Objectives

Project Objective	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	No Project / Existing General Plan Alternative	Existing Nutwood Avenue Configuration Alternative	Underground Nutwood Avenue Alternative	Reduced Intensity Alternative
Create a new landscape plaza by closing a segment of Nutwood Avenue to vehicular traffic, between Folino and Titan Drive to allow for safe crossing of pedestrians and bicyclists, and provide a central location for community/campus events and everyday outdoor enjoyment.	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent
Provide an economically stable project that is financially feasible for private sector developers and that produces a net fiscal benefit for the City.	Yes	No	Yes, but not to the same extent	Yes	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

This alternative would lessen air quality and cultural resources impacts from significant and unavoidable to less than significant after mitigation. Transportation and traffic impacts would be reduced but would remain significant and unavoidable in this alternative. This alternative would also reduce impacts to aesthetics, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, noise, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems, relative to those of the proposed project; however, all those impacts of the proposed project would be either less than significant or less than significant after mitigation. Impacts to hydrology and water quality are generally the same as the proposed project.

Although this alternative would lessen some environmental impacts, it would not avoid the significant environmental impacts to transportation and traffic. It would provide less housing opportunities near HIU and CSUF and would not promote the objectives of the City's, HIU's, and CSUF's long-range goals for the CollegeTown Specific Plan to the same extent as the proposed project. This alternative could achieve one objective, creating a destination identity attracting the surrounding communities, but to a lesser degree than the proposed project would. This alternative would not achieve any of the other project objectives.

Since the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is a "No Project" alternative, the following development alternative has been identified as "environmentally superior" to the proposed project:

- Reduced Intensity Alternative

The Reduced Intensity Alternative was selected as the environmentally superior development alternative because it would reduce environmental impacts while achieving all of the objectives of the proposed project; however, to a lesser extent. While this alternative would result in a new GHG emissions impact, this alternative would reduce impacts to air quality, noise (operational), public services, recreation, utilities and service systems, and transportation and traffic. This alternative would reduce but would not eliminate the significant air quality and transportation and traffic impacts of the project.

This alternative would achieve all of the objectives of the proposed project. However, this alternative would achieve objectives regarding providing housing, especially housing for students, to a much lower degree due to the 50 percent reduction in residential units. This alternative also would achieve objectives regarding provision of a mix of nonresidential land uses, in addition to residential land uses, to a lower degree than the proposed project due to the 25 percent reduction in nonresidential land uses.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

This page intentionally left blank.