

5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

REASONS FOR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

The ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines require the identification and evaluation of reasonable alternatives designed to meet most of the project's objectives (see ~~Section 2~~, Project ~~Description~~ Objectives of this RDEIR), while reducing the environmental impacts of the project.¹ The CEQA Guidelines further discuss the intent and extent of the alternatives analysis to be provided in an EIR. Alternatives are an important tool in the CEQA process to provide decision makers with comparative information about the impacts of a specific project, and how other possible projects could reduce those impacts, even if some of the objectives of the project are not met or would be more costly.

As stated in Section 15151 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must contain "...a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes into account environmental consequences" of the proposed action. Identification and evaluation of a range of reasonable project alternatives as required by Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines is an essential part of providing sufficient information. Pursuant to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the discussion of alternatives must also identify the environmentally superior alternative. However, the analysis of the environmental effects of project alternatives need not be as thorough or detailed as the analysis of the project itself. The intent of the alternatives analysis is to ensure that other approaches to avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts were considered. The merits of the alternatives and how potential environmental impacts of the alternatives compare to the project offer valuable information to the lead agency.

NUMBER OF ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED

Neither ~~the~~ CEQA ~~statute~~, the CEQA Guidelines, nor recent court cases specify a precise number of alternatives to be evaluated in an EIR. Rather, "the range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by the rule of reason that sets forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice."² However, the CEQA Guidelines require that a "No Project" alternative must be included, and if appropriate, an alternative site location should be analyzed.³ 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. Alternative sites for the Project that were not located on the Harvard-Westlake Campus were considered and dismissed due to the lack of similarly sized available properties within reasonable proximity to the Harvard-Westlake Campus. However, an alternative site located on the Harvard-Westlake Campus on the east side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue was analyzed. If appropriate, other Project alternatives may involve a modification of the proposed land uses, density, or other Project elements at the same Project location.

Criteria for Establishing Impacts

Alternatives should be selected on the basis of their ability to attain most of the basic objectives of a project while reducing the project's significant environmental effects. The CEQA Guidelines state that "...[t]he EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting alternatives to be discussed [and]...shall include sufficient information to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis and comparison with the Proposed Project."⁴ The feasibility of the alternatives is another consideration in the selection of alternatives. The CEQA Guidelines state that "[a]mong the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives

¹ CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6

² CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(f).

³ CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.6(e) and 15126(f)(2).

⁴ Section 15126.6(e) and Section 15126(f).

are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations [and] jurisdictional boundaries...”⁵ “The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making.”⁶ Alternatives that are considered remote or speculative, or whose effects cannot be reasonably predicted do not require consideration.

Although the potential to mitigate significant project-related impacts and to reasonably inform the decision-maker and the public are primary considerations in the Alternatives selection, the feasibility of the Alternative is important.

Project Level Impacts

As addressed in this RDEIR, the Project would create unavoidable significant impacts as follows:

- ~~Significant air quality impacts during construction at up to six homes located adjacent to the site west of Coldwater Canyon Avenue.~~
- Impacts to oak-walnut woodlands could result in Project-specific impacts to sensitive species (San Bernardino ringneck snake and coastal western whiptail) and a cumulatively considerable contribution to loss of oak-walnut woodland habitat and other sensitive species that forage on the Development Site on occasion.
- Significant noise impacts during construction at approximately 36 sensitive receptors (homes and the Sunnyside Preschool) in the vicinity of the Development Site on both sides of Coldwater Canyon Avenue. Mitigation measures would reduce construction noise levels but not below a level of significance during the most impactful phase of construction (excavation, hauling, soil nailing and placing shotcrete). Mitigated construction noise levels would exceed the 5-dBA significance threshold at about 51 sensitive receptors (homes on the east and west side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue in the vicinity of the Development Site and the St. Michael’s Church (which includes Sunnyside Preschool)).

Other potentially significant impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the respective impact analysis sections of this RDEIR

As called for by the CEQA Guidelines, the achievement of project objectives must be balanced by the ability of an alternative to reduce the significant impacts of a project. The Proposed Project’s objectives include increasing on-campus parking supply, thereby reducing parking impacts on the surrounding community, and improving traffic flow adjacent to the ~~School~~ Harvard-Westlake Campus and increasing safety. Specifically, the objectives of the Project are:

- Increase on-site parking supply for the Harvard-Westlake Campus for regular school use, as well as for typical school-related activities outside of regular school hours (such as football games), essentially eliminating the need for school-related vehicles to park on-street, either on Coldwater Canyon Avenue or in the residential neighborhood north of the Harvard-Westlake Campus.
- Improve area circulation by removing vehicles and buses parking on Coldwater Canyon Avenue and on other nearby residential streets.
- Improve the flow of traffic on Coldwater Canyon Avenue by constructing the following public improvements at no cost to the City or to the community:

⁵ Section 15126.6(f)(1).

⁶ Section 15126.6(f).

- Provide one northbound through lane and two southbound through lanes on Coldwater Canyon Avenue along the Development Site frontage (resulting in the addition of one southbound through lane).
- At the intersection of Coldwater Canyon Avenue and the Development Site's northerly driveway opposite the relocated Main Entrance driveway, provide:
 - Northbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane and one right-turn lane;
 - Southbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes and one right-turn lane;
 - Eastbound: One left-turn lane and one optional through/right-turn lane; and
 - Westbound: One left-turn lane and one optional through/right-turn lane.
- At the intersection of Coldwater Canyon Avenue and the Development Site's northerly driveway opposite the relocated Main Entrance, provide new traffic signal equipment, including left-turn phasing for northbound and southbound Coldwater Canyon Avenue traffic, and LADOT's ATSAC/ATCS equipment with connection to the Coldwater Canyon Avenue intersection at Ventura Boulevard.
- At the intersection of Coldwater Canyon Avenue and the Development Site's southerly driveway, provide:
 - Northbound: One through lane (i.e., no left-turns from northbound Coldwater Canyon Avenue to the southerly driveway will be permitted).
 - Southbound: Two through lanes and one right-turn lane.
 - Eastbound: One optional left-turn/right-lane (controlled by a stop sign, with no left-turns permitted weekdays 7:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.).
- Enhance safety and security associated with vehicular and pedestrian circulation on the Harvard-Westlake Campus and in the surrounding area, including the relocation of:
 - Cars that currently park off-campus along Coldwater Canyon Avenue and neighboring streets, and
 - School bus drop-off/pick-up operations on-site.
- Enhance playing practice field facilities, to increase opportunities for recreational activities on-campus. ~~The number of events that occur on campus would not change. The school would be able to hold simultaneous practice sessions on separate fields instead of on the same field as currently occurs.~~

ALTERNATIVES REJECTED FROM CONSIDERATION

Off-Site (Leased) Parking

This RDEIR does not analyze an alternative on property that the Harvard-Westlake School does not own (for example leasing parking along Ventura Boulevard or elsewhere). Such an alternative is speculative and infeasible. In addition parking facilities on Ventura Boulevard would cause logistical problems for students, faculty and staff in getting to Campus in a timely fashion, potentially resulting in more traffic circulating between the campus and any facility on Ventura Boulevard. In addition, it is anticipated that such an alternative would not alleviate parking in the neighborhood as students would prefer to park closer to the Harvard-Westlake School without the need of taking a shuttle.

Increased Transportation Demand Management

The Harvard-Westlake School has a complicated program of activities that includes a variety of after-school programs. Most students and faculty arrive at the same time in the morning, but the end of the day involves numerous activities with staggered end times resulting in limitations on how much carpooling, transit and busing can be done by students and faculty. In addition, the Harvard-Westlake Campus has numerous events

where guests come to Campus for relatively brief periods of time and need parking (e.g. parent teacher meetings, committee meetings, etc.). Increasing TDM is a mitigation measure that could help reduce demand for parking but not to the extent that additional parking would not be needed. Existing TDM at the Harvard-Westlake School and the potential to increase TDM is discussed in Section 3.8 Transportation Circulation and Parking.

Subsurface Parking East of Coldwater Canyon Avenue and/or Subsurface Tunnel Under Coldwater Canyon Avenue

The Harvard-Westlake Campus (on the east side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue) is located at a low-point, or a sump, of an estimated 140-acre watershed, which makes the construction of a subterranean parking structure on the Harvard-Westlake Campus infeasible. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Hydraulic and Hydrology Manual requires that new construction within a sump be designed to withstand the discharge from a 50-year storm event. (Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Hydraulic and Hydrology Manual, January 2006.) Using the County's methodology, including rainfall data, it is estimated that the potential runoff from a 50-year storm would be approximately 440 cubic feet per second. Currently, there is a 24-inch reinforced concrete pipe storm drain, which has a capacity to drain less than 20 cubic feet per second. To satisfy the County's minimum requirement, significant additional infrastructure would need to be constructed beneath the Harvard-Westlake Campus and Coldwater Canyon Avenue to convey the large flow differential; pipe sizes in the range of 60 to 84 inches in diameter could be required. Installation of a large storm drain pipe in Coldwater Canyon Avenue is not feasible due to the existing utility infrastructure (including the recently installed 60-inch DWP water line, three-inch gas line, six-inch water line, 51-inch water line, eight-inch sewer and PT&T telephone infrastructure among others) already occupying the space (i.e. there is not sufficient space to install the required infrastructure). Because of the required infrastructure and the existing infrastructure improvements beneath Coldwater Canyon Avenue and the resultant space limitations, it is not feasible to construct the additional required infrastructure to drain discharge from a 50-year storm event.⁷

~~In addition,~~ The Harvard-Westlake Campus has a high water table and is located in a sump, which creates potential safety concerns due to the potential higher incidence of flooding. On the east side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue, groundwater was observed at a depth of 29 feet during a 2011 boring relating to the construction of the Harvard-Westlake School pool but not during the 2014 boring conducted in the area of the eastern bridge support (to a maximum depth of 41 feet). The potential for rapid flooding with little warning and reliance on mechanical pumping of runoff increase the safety risk, making subterranean parking infeasible ~~(on either side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue).~~

~~Constructing a partial subterranean parking structure (one subterranean level, one at grade level, and one above grade level and an athletic field on the top) on the west side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue would lower the height of the top of the structure by approximately 12 feet as compared to the project; however, this alternative would require that the base of the retaining wall be 12 feet deeper as compared to the Project, which would result in the retaining wall becoming more visible from Coldwater Canyon because the structure would be lower and the retaining wall would be set back further from Coldwater Canyon Avenue. In addition, this alternative would increase grading by approximately 44,000 cubic yards. The construction period would be extended by approximately 20 weeks (8 weeks for grading and 12 weeks for building construction) as compared to the Project. In addition mechanical ventilation of the subsurface parking would be required.~~

⁷ Letter regarding Harvard-Westlake School Parking Structure, Doug Conlon, Associate, KPFF, June 8, 2015 (see Appendix E.4).

With respect to building a subterranean tunnel beneath Coldwater Canyon Avenue to connect the Parking Structure and the west side of the Harvard-Westlake Campus, as discussed above, there are large-capacity infrastructure improvements beneath Coldwater Canyon Avenue, including the DWP's recently constructed city trunk water line, data/phone lines and storm water facilities, which make the construction of a tunnel under Coldwater Canyon Avenue infeasible. Additionally there are safety concerns associated with a high water table and potential flooding during storms.

Sports Practice Field Only

Without providing increased parking, most of the Project objectives would not be satisfied and therefore such an alternative is not required under CEQA. An alternative with reduced parking is considered in the analysis (see Alternative 3).

Smaller Parking Structures Throughout The Harvard-Westlake Campus

There are three main surface parking areas on-campus. None of them are large enough to allow construction of a practice field, which is one of the key objectives of the Proposed Project. Therefore none of these locations is desirable for the Harvard-Westlake School. With respect to each of these parking areas: 1) development of the Southern Lot is addressed in Alternative 5 below; 2) development of a multi-story structure on the Senior Lot (north of the Southern Lot) would impede student circulation on the Harvard-Westlake Campus and would result in similar impacts to development of the Southern Lot potentially with additional impacts (visual quality, lighting and noise) to more residential uses to the east of the Harvard-Westlake Campus; and 3) development of the small lot at the northeast corner of the Harvard-Westlake Campus (Rugby Lot) would be severely constrained – access is by a single lane driveway that is bordered by buildings, topography and an adjacent ditch. In addition, surrounding residential development is located immediately adjacent to the parking area – all of these factors make development of a multi-story structure in this location infeasible.

Two-Stories Above Grade, One Story Below Grade

This alternative would include one subterranean level (11 feet 4 inches below grade) and two stories above grade (plus rooftop practice field). The same area of the Development Site would be disturbed. Construction activities would be similar to the Proposed Project. It would require an additional 56,000 cubic yards of excavated soil to be removed (for a total of 196,000 cubic yards). The height of the structure would be reduced by approximately 11 feet 4 inches from 44 feet 6 inches to 33 feet 2 inches, but the height of the retaining walls would not change and therefore views of the Development Site would be similar to the Project inasmuch as the Parking Structure or wall would be visible on the Development Site. The retaining walls would therefore become more visible behind the Parking Structure. Therefore, this alternative was not explored further because it would have the same significant impacts as those of the Proposed Project and provides no environmental benefit compared to the Proposed Project.

Groundwater was not encountered on the west side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue during the six borings conducted in 1998 (to a maximum depth of 43 feet), ten borings conducted in 2009 (to a maximum depth of 71 feet), and eight borings conducted in 2014 (to a maximum depth of 76 feet). Therefore groundwater is not a concern on the west side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue, nor is the Development Site located in the sump.

Mechanical ventilation of the subsurface parking would be required which would increase energy use and exhaust of the ventilation would have to be carefully located to avoid noise and air quality impacts.

OVERVIEW OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The following alternatives were considered as feasible alternatives to the Project:

1. No Project. Under this alternative, nothing would change on the Development Site. The walnut trees (~~274~~ 273 trees) would continue to die and would not be replaced. The area adjacent to Coldwater Canyon Avenue would continue to be used for storage of construction equipment and ~~school~~ the Harvard-Westlake School equipment and supplies.
2. Existing Zoning (4 new homes). This alternative would result in continuation of ~~school~~ the Harvard-Westlake School parking on- Coldwater Canyon Avenue and in the adjacent neighborhoods. The Development Site would be improved with residential uses consistent with the existing zoning.
3. Reduced Development Alternative (Two-Story Structure, No ~~Athletic-Practice~~ Field, No Pedestrian Bridge). This alternative would involve the construction of a two-story parking structure containing approximately 500 spaces. This alternative would not include an ~~athletic-practice~~ field (and would therefore not include lighting on the top deck). This alternative would not include a pedestrian bridge. Rather it would include a cross walk (with a signal). There would be no activity on the roof of this structure. This alternative would not include as much parking as the Project and therefore, parking in the Southern Parking Lot would still be needed. It would remain as a parking lot. Bus operations would continue to occur on Coldwater Canyon Avenue.
4. Smaller Footprint Parking Structure, No ~~Athletic Practice~~ Field, Rooftop Parking. This alternative would have the same number of spaces as the Project. The structure would include five parking levels including parking on the roof level; ~~therefore~~ The footprint of the structure would be smaller than for the Proposed Project as there would be the same number of parking spaces spread over five levels of parking as compared to three levels under the Proposed Project. This alternative would include the ~~Pedestrian Bridge~~ pedestrian bridge.
5. East Side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue –Southern Parking Lot, No Practice Field, Rooftop Parking. This alternative considers placing the Parking Structure on the Southern Parking Lot located at the southern end of the Campus east of Coldwater Canyon Avenue.

ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO PROJECT

Description of Alternative

This alternative assumes that the Project would not be constructed. The Development Site would continue to be used for storage of construction equipment and school equipment and supplies. The on-site walnut trees (~~274~~ 273 trees) would continue to deteriorate and die and would not be replaced.

Impact Comparison

The following environmental impacts would be expected under the No Project alternative.

Aesthetics/Views/Lighting

Visual Quality. The character of the ~~site~~ Development Site would remain as at present. The walnut trees would continue to die as part of the natural cycle of tree death and regrowth, although the widespread existence of the Walnut Twig Beetle and TCD introduces the possible non-viability of the entire onsite walnut tree population. ~~At the same time, project impacts would be less than significant as cutting down trees and~~

~~replanting them can also be part of the natural cycle.~~ The relative merits of a natural slope with dying/dead trees as compared to a new ~~Parking Structure~~ parking structure with high design values and substantial landscaping is subjective and could depend on the viewer. Under the Proposed Project, removal of all protected trees would be mitigated at a ratio of 4:1 resulting in many more protected trees being located on the Development Site than are there now, thereby allowing replacement of dead walnut trees in areas of the Development Site that would not be touched by the Project. The No Project Alternative, as with the Project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation.

Views. Views of the ~~site~~ Development Site would remain as at present. As with the Project, impacts would be less than significant as tree death and regrowth is part of the natural cycle.

Lighting. Lighting on the ~~site~~ Development Site would remain as at present. There would be no new lighting as would occur under the Project. There would be no impacts to lighting. No new lighting would be introduced on the ~~Project~~ Development Site. The No Project Alternative would have no impact on lighting as compared to the Project, which would have a less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

Air Quality

Construction. There would be no construction under the No Project Alternative. Therefore, there would be no impacts to air quality under the No Project Alternative as compared to the Proposed Project with impacts that would be less than significant with mitigation.

Operation. Since there would be no change to the ~~Project~~ Development Site under the No Project alternative and the property would remain in its existing condition, there would be no operational impacts to air quality (as compared to the Project which would have a less than significant impact on operational emissions).

Biological Resources

Trees. The on-site walnuts would continue to die without being replaced. Under the Project approximately 60 64% of the site would be in native vegetation/landscaping, and dying trees would be replaced with healthy trees as appropriate -- protected trees lost due to development would be replaced at a ratio of 4:1 which would fill in for dying walnuts both in the impact area and on the rest of the ~~site~~ Development Site where walnuts are dying and vegetation is generally sparse. No new trees would be planted under this alternative and the hillside ecosystem would remain intact. ~~Nonetheless,~~ Retention of the native landscaping under the No Project alternative would ~~result in fewer impacts~~ eliminate the significant impacts to oak-walnut woodlands and associated ~~to~~ biological resources as compared to the project. The No Project Alternative would have no impact on trees.

Birds and Other Native Species. The No Project Alternative would not impact biological resources on the ~~Project~~ Development Site. Changes in the tree population could change the mix of species on the site but the impact would be less than significant, as compared to the Project, which would have a cumulatively significant and unavoidable impact with respect to sensitive (including bird) species.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would result in no disturbance to the hillside. Therefore there would be no impacts to potential archeological or paleontological resources, as compared to the Project, which would have a less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

Geology, Soils and Hydrology

Grading. The No Project Alternative would result in no grading of the site; ~~135,000~~ Under the Project, conservatively 140,000 cubic yards of soil would ~~not~~ be removed from the ~~Project Development Site~~. The No Project alternative would have no impact on grading as compared to the Project which would have a ~~Therefore impacts would be~~ less-than-significant impact.

Seismicity. The hillside on the ~~Project Development Site~~ would remain in its current state. While there may be some liquefiable soils on the ~~Development Site~~, no major instability is anticipated. The No Project alternative would have no impact on seismicity as compared to the Project which would have a ~~Impacts would be~~ less-than-significant impact.

Hydrology. Under the No Project alternative, hydrologic impacts would remain as at present. No erosion would occur as a result of construction activity. Impacts would remain as at present. The No Project alternative would have no impact on hydrology as compared to the Project which would have a ~~and would be~~ less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

Water Quality. There would be no impacts to water quality on the site as a result of construction and vehicular activity. There would be no impacts to water quality, as compared to the Project, which would have a less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

Land Use and Planning

Consistency with Adjacent Uses. The Development Site would remain in its present condition. There would be no change in land use from a partially vacant site to a parking garage. The No Project alternative would have no impact on adjacent land use as compared to the Project which would have a ~~Impacts to land use would be~~ less-than-significant impact.

Consistency with Plans. There would be no change in land use at the Development Site; therefore there would be no impact to consistency with applicable plans, as compared to the Project, which would have a less-than-significant impact with respect to plan consistency.

Noise

Construction. No construction would occur at the Project Site. Therefore the significant construction noise impacts that would be associated with the Project would not occur under this alternative.

Operation. Under the No Project alternative, noise levels on the Development Site would remain as at present. There would be no noise associated with operation of a new parking garage and athletic practice field. Therefore impacts would be less than the Project for which impacts would be less than significant.

Transportation and Circulation

Under the No Project alternative, traffic would remain as in its present state, and the parking and circulation improvements proposed under the Project would not occur. Traffic improvements adjacent to the ~~Project Development Site~~ would not occur, and school bus operations would continue to occur along Coldwater Canyon Avenue instead of on the Harvard-Westlake Campus. In addition, overflow parking would continue in the surrounding neighborhoods. As a result, the associated benefits anticipated under the Project would not occur. Therefore, impacts of this alternative would be greater than the Project but less than significant compared to existing conditions, since there would be no change. Project impacts would be less than significant.

Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

This alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives. The on-site parking supply for the Harvard-Westlake Campus would not be increased, and school-related vehicles would continue to park on-street, either on Coldwater Canyon Avenue or in the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Circulation and safety in the vicinity would not be improved as vehicles and school buses would continue to park and load/unload students on Coldwater Canyon Avenue. The flow of traffic on Coldwater Canyon Avenue would not be improved since the improvements proposed under the Project would not be constructed. Finally, there would be no increased opportunities for recreational activities on ~~campus~~ the Harvard-Westlake Campus since the proposed ~~athletic~~ athletic practice field would not be constructed. Thus, this alternative would not meet Project objectives.

Conclusion

On-site protected trees (walnuts) would continue to die (from the infectious ~~fungus disease~~ TCD) without being replaced outside of the natural cycle of tree death and regrowth. Traffic improvements along Coldwater Canyon Avenue adjacent to the ~~Project~~ Development Site would not be implemented, school buses would continue to load and unload students along Coldwater Canyon Avenue, and overflow parking would continue to occur within the surrounding areas. The No Project alternative would reduce or avoid all other significant, less than significant, and significant but mitigated environmental impacts that would occur under the Project. As discussed in more detail later in this section, the No Project alternative is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative. However, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) provides that when the No Project alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, another environmentally superior alternative must be identified from among the other alternatives.

ALTERNATIVE 2 – EXISTING ZONING (4 NEW HOMES)

Description of Alternative

This alternative assumes that the Project would not be constructed. This alternative assumes that the ~~site~~ Development Site would be developed consistent with existing zoning and without the need for a discretionary permit. While there are pads for four homes on the Development Site plus one vacant home, in order to have one point of access on Coldwater Canyon Avenue and to provide for high-end housing, some grading would be required. This alternative would result in 35,250 cubic yards of grading (23,000 cubic yards of cut and 12,250 cubic yards of fill), with 10,750 cubic yards of export. Under existing zoning, approximately four new homes could be constructed on the Development Site (see **Figure 5-1**) and the existing home on Potosi Avenue could be re-occupied or upgraded. Grading beyond the base limits permitted under the Baseline Hillside Ordinance would not be allowable without a discretionary permit.

Impact Comparison

The following environmental impacts would be expected with implementation of Alternative 2.

Aesthetics/Views/Lighting

Visual Quality. This alternative would involve grading but not to the same extent as the Project. The majority of the hillsides would likely remain in their existing conditions. Impacts would be less than the Project.



Harvard-Westlake Parking Structure ■

SOURCE: IDG Parkitects, Inc.

Figure 5-1

Alternative 2 -- Conceptual Layout of Four New Homesites

Views. Views of the Development Site would be that of a vegetated hillside with a grouping of homes along Coldwater Canyon Avenue. Views would change less than they would under the Project.

Lighting. Lighting from the Parking Structure and pedestrian bridge, through the use of shielded covers and focused LED fixtures, would not result in spillover or direct glare to adjacent properties and is therefore comparable to the low level residential lighting of four homes. However, lighting impacts would still be less than under the Project since there would be no nighttime lighting of the athletic practice field, ~~and homes would be lit in a similar fashion to other nearby homes, with low level residential lighting.~~ As with the Project, impacts would be less than significant.

Air Quality

Construction. Air quality impacts would result from construction of the homes. The amount of grading under this alternative is anticipated to be less than the Project and construction associated with four homes would be less than that associated with the Project. Therefore construction air quality impacts would be less than the Project and are anticipated to be less than significant. With mitigation, Project impacts would be less than significant

Operational. Operational air quality emissions ~~on the whole~~ would be somewhat increased as compared to the Project since this alternative results in the addition of vehicle trips whereas the Project does not. Although operational air quality emissions at the Development Site would generally be less under this alternative since the Parking Structure would not be constructed, the emissions associated with the vehicles that would park in the Parking Structure under the Project would still occur in the vicinity since they are presently associated with existing cars that would be relocated from the Harvard-Westlake Campus and surrounding area to the Development Site. This alternative would result in incremental new trips (approximately 38 per day) to the area that would incrementally increase emissions in the area and region. However, as with the Project, impacts of the Existing Zoning Alternative would be less than significant.

Biological Resources

Trees. Development of the ~~site~~ Development Site with four new homes would result in some grading of the Development Site (35,250 cubic yards total as compared to ~~135,000~~ conservatively 140,000 cubic yards under the Project) ~~of the site~~, but in general, the natural vegetated hillside would remain. Grading and development of home sites is only conceptual for purposes of this RDEIR analysis and therefore the acreage of impacted woodland and number of impacted trees cannot be precisely determined. ~~It~~ Nonetheless, it is estimated that this alternative would impact approximately half the number of protected trees as compared to the Project. It is anticipated that the developer applicant would also address some of the dying walnuts that would not otherwise need to be removed, in order to make the site attractive for new homeowners. Impacted trees would be mitigated in accordance with the Protected Tree Ordinance and Board of Public Works requirements. Impacts to oak-walnut woodlands would be reduced and therefore Project-specific impacts to sensitive species (San Bernardino ringneck snake and coastal western whiptail) and a cumulatively considerable contribution to loss of oak-walnut woodland habitat and other sensitive species that use the Development Site on occasion would be reduced, likely below a level of significance.

Birds and Other Native Species. Development of up to four residences consistent with the existing zoning could impact biological resources on-site as a result of construction activity disturbing nearby wildlife, the possible introduction of non-native ornamental plant species commonly associated with residential development, and human intrusion in to the hillside when the homes are occupied. Due to the smaller footprint of anticipated development, it is anticipated that impacts to biological resources would be less than under the Project.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would result in less area of disturbance to native soils. Therefore impacts would be less than the Project, and would be less than significant as for the Project.

Geology, Soils and Hydrology

Grading. This alternative would result in less grading (35,250 cubic yards with 10,250 cubic yards of export) as compared to the ~~135,000~~ conservatively 140,000 cubic yards of soil to be removed as a result of the Project. Impacts would be less than the Project as a result of a smaller footprint of development and reduced grading, and would be less than significant.

Seismicity. Introduction of four homes would increase the population on the Development Site that could be exposed to geologic hazards, although this would be anticipated to be less than the Project and, as the same as for the Project, less than significant as a result of compliance with applicable codes.

Hydrology. Development of four new homes could result in impacts to hydrology/drainage on the ~~Project~~ Development Site as a result of the introduction of new impermeable surfaces. However, impacts are anticipated to be less than the Project as a result of the smaller footprint of developed area and the reduced grading anticipated for this alternative. Similar to the Project, reduction in the steepness of on-site slopes could result in increased on-site water retention and infiltration. As for the Project, impacts on hydrology would be less than significant with mitigation.

Water Quality. Human activity on the ~~site~~ Development Site associated with the homes could decrease water quality. However, impacts are anticipated to be less than the Project as a result of the smaller footprint of developed area and the reduced grading anticipated for this alternative. As for the Project, impacts on water quality would be less than significant with mitigation.

Land Use and Planning

Consistency with Adjacent Uses. The development of four new homes would be compatible with adjacent residential uses. Consequently, the land use impacts associated with this alternative would be less than those of the Project and would remain less than significant.

Consistency with Plans. In contrast to the Proposed Project, Alternative 2 would not require a conditional use permit. The development of four homes would be consistent with existing land use designations and zoning requirements. Impacts would be less than the Project and would remain less than significant.

Noise

Construction. Construction could generate short-term impacts, however, single-family home construction would not generate noise impacts to the same extent as the Project because of the substantially reduced amount of grading and the reduced amount of construction associated with four single-family homes as compared to the Project. The noise impacts associated with this alternative would generally be less than those of the Project, since it would require substantially less grading and construction of four single-family homes would require less construction equipment than the proposed Parking Structure. Impacts of constructing four new homes would be less than significant with mitigation as compared to the Project, which would have significant impacts on noise during construction.

Operation. Operational noise at the Development Site would be less than the Project since there would be no parking or athletic practice activity. During peak hours mobile-source noise on surrounding streets would

incrementally increase as compared to the Project since traffic associated with the residential uses would occur during these times, whereas there would not be any new traffic during these times under the Project. Nonetheless, impacts would be less than significant as with the Project.

Transportation and Circulation

Single-family homes generate 9.57 trips per unit per day, 0.75 trips per unit in the AM peak hour and 1.01 trips per unit in the PM peak hour, according to the Institute of Transportation Engineers' 8th Edition Trip Generation Report. Therefore, this alternative would generate 38.28 new daily trips, 3 AM peak hour trips, and 4.04 PM peak hour trips as compared to the Project, which would not generate any new trips. Traffic impacts would be worse than the Project but likely still not significant. Furthermore, the parking and circulation improvements proposed under the Project would not occur. Traffic improvements adjacent to the Project Site would not occur, and school bus operations would continue along Coldwater Canyon Avenue instead of on the Harvard-Westlake Campus. In addition, overflow parking would continue in the surrounding neighborhoods. Parking would be the same as under existing conditions with 578 spaces on the campus (see **Table 2-1** in the Project Description) and use of 104 ~~121~~ off-campus spaces (including approximately 64 ~~81~~ on surrounding public streets and 40 spaces in the St. Michael's church parking lot). As with the Project, impacts on transportation and circulation would be less than significant.

Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

This alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives. The on-site parking supply for the Harvard-Westlake Campus would not be increased, and school-related vehicles would continue to park on-street, either on Coldwater Canyon Avenue or in the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Circulation and safety in the vicinity would not be improved as vehicles and school buses would continue to park and load/unload students on Coldwater Canyon Avenue. The flow of traffic on Coldwater Canyon Avenue adjacent to the ~~Project~~ Development Site would not be improved. Finally, there would be no increased opportunities for athletic/recreational activities on Campus since the proposed ~~athletic~~ athletic practice field would not be constructed. Thus, this alternative would not meet the Project objectives.

Conclusion

This alternative would not meet the objectives of the Project. Traffic improvements along Coldwater Canyon Avenue would not be implemented, school buses would continue to load and unload students along Coldwater Canyon Avenue, and overflow parking would continue to occur within the surrounding areas. In addition, this alternative would generate approximately 38 new daily trips. Operational noise and air quality emissions would be increased as compared to the Project as a result of the vehicle trips generated by the development associated with this alternative.

ALTERNATIVE 3 – REDUCED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE (TWO-STORY STRUCTURE, NO ATHLETIC PRACTICE FIELD, NO PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE)

Description of Alternative

This alternative would reduce the number of levels of parking to two from three, thus reducing the amount of construction. There would be no activity on the roof. Approximately the same footprint would be graded. This alternative would not include a ~~an athletic~~ practice field (and would therefore not include lighting on the top deck). This alternative would not include a pedestrian bridge. Rather it would include a cross walk (with a signal). Since this alternative would include fewer parking spaces, the Southern Parking Lot would continue to be used for parking and therefore bus parking would continue to occur on Coldwater Canyon Avenue. This alternative would not provide the same parking benefits as the Project as it would provide one-

third fewer spaces (approximately 500 spaces as compared to 750 under the Project). ~~The athletic practice field and associated lights would not be included under this alternative.~~ **Figure 5-2** shows an aerial photograph with a rendering of Alternative 3.

Impact Comparison

Aesthetics/Views/Lighting

Visual Quality. The massing of the ~~structure~~ Parking Structure would be similar under this alternative (the same ~~less~~ length along Coldwater Canyon Avenue but one ~~less~~ ~~additional~~ story) and there would be no ~~Pedestrian Bridge~~ pedestrian bridge. Bus parking would continue on Coldwater Canyon Avenue, which would continue to have a negative impact on visual quality. Impacts would be less than the Project due to no ~~Pedestrian Bridge~~ pedestrian bridge and would continue to be less than significant.

Views. The parking structure would be visible in similar views as the Project. This alternative would not include a pedestrian bridge across Coldwater Canyon Avenue (a designated scenic highway in the City of Los Angeles). Substantial landscaping and mitigation of impacts to trees would continue to occur. Given that retaining walls would need to be the same height as for the Project, the reduced number of parking structure stories associated with this alternative results in the retaining walls becoming more visible. Impacts would be less than the Project and would continue to be less than significant with mitigation.

Lighting. There would be minimal new lighting impacts since there would be no ~~athletic practice~~ field atop the structure nor any activity atop the structure. New lighting would occur from security lighting of the structure including internal security lights and headlights. Impacts would be less than the Project and would be less than significant.

Air Quality

Construction. While the amount of construction under this alternative would be less, the amount of grading would be the same the same, therefore the significant and air quality impacts related to grading would ~~remain under this alternative,~~ be similar to the Project (less than significant with mitigation). Overall, construction impacts to air quality would be slightly less than the Project since construction would be shortened as compared to the Project as a result of the parking structure having one less level; ~~however, impacts would remain significant because of the same amount of grading~~ impacts would continue to be less than significant with mitigation as with the Project.

Operation. Although operational air quality emissions at the Development Site would generally be less under this alternative since there would be fewer spaces in the Parking Structure, the emissions associated with these vehicles would still occur in the vicinity since they presently occur, and are associated with existing cars that would be relocated from the Harvard-Westlake Campus and surrounding area to the Development Site under the Project. Therefore, impacts would be similar to the Project and less than significant.



SOURCE: IDG Parkitects, Inc.

Harvard-Westlake Parking Structure ■

Figure 5-2

Alternative 3 -- Reduced Development

Biological Resources

Trees. This alternative would result in the same slightly reduced similar impacts to trees as the building footprint would remain unchanged and a debris basin would still be required, ~~approximately 5% to 10% fewer trees would be lost under this alternative as compared to the Project.~~ The same mitigation measures would be required as for the Project. Therefore, impacts would be similar to the Project ~~and less than significant.~~ as a result of loss of the oak-walnut woodland, conservatively considered to be significant with respect to Project-specific impacts to sensitive species (San Bernardino ringneck snake and coastal western whiptail) and a cumulatively considerable contribution to loss of oak-walnut woodland habitat and other sensitive species that forage the Development Site on occasion.

Birds and Other Native Species. This alternative would result in the same similar impacts to biological resources in general as the Project since the grading and building footprint would remain ~~approximately~~ the same. The same mitigation measures would be required as for the Project. Therefore, impacts would be similar to the Project ~~and less than --~~ Project-specific impacts to sensitive species (San Bernardino ringneck snake and coastal western whiptail) and a cumulatively considerable contribution to loss of oak-walnut woodland habitat and other sensitive species that forage on the Development Site on occasion.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would result in the same area of disturbance. Therefore impacts would be the same as the Project and less than significant with mitigation.

Geology, Soils and Hydrology

Grading. This alternative would result in the same level of grading and soil export as ~~approximately 129,000 cubic yards with approximately 123,000 cubic yards of export as compared to 135,000 the 140,000 cubic yards of grading and export under~~ the Proposed Project. Impacts for this alternative and the Project would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Seismicity. This alternative would result in fewer people using the Development Site should a seismic event occur, as there would be fewer spaces and no ~~athletic practice~~ field. The structure would comply with applicable codes and impacts would continue to be less than significant as with the Project. Impacts would be less than the Project.

Hydrology. Impacts to hydrology would be the same as similar to the Project as the footprint of the parking structure would be the same and the same area of impermeable surfaces would be added. Compliance with applicable regulations including the ~~Low Impact Development (LID)~~ Ordinance would result in less than significant impacts as with the Project.

Water Quality. Impacts to water quality would be similar to the Project but incrementally less due to less intense use of the ~~site~~ Development Site (fewer parking spaces and no athletic activities). Impacts would continue to be less than significant with mitigation under this alternative as with the Project.

Land Use and Planning

Compatibility with Adjacent Uses. This alternative would result in similar compatibility impacts as the Project. The reduced massing and height of this alternative would make the structure closer in scale to some of the larger buildings on the Campus. Since this alternative would not provide all the spaces anticipated to be needed, increased parking, as compared to the Project but less than currently occurs, would continue in the surrounding neighborhoods. Therefore, land use impacts would be similar to the Project on the Development

Site (and less than significant), but could increase impacts on adjacent uses as compared to the Project, but less than at present.

Consistency with Plans. This alternative would result in similar less-than-significant impacts to land use planning as the Project since the Project would provide a parking use on the site and would still require the approval of a conditional use permit.

Noise

Construction. As this alternative would reduce the amount of construction, the duration of construction noise impacts would be less. However, the anticipated construction noise impact associated with grading would be the same as similar to that of the Project and would be significant (i.e. significant), ~~construction of the structure would occur for an incrementally shorter duration.~~

Operation. Operational noise impacts would be less than the Project, as there would be no athletic practice field (nor any parking) atop the Parking Structure and fewer parking spaces.

Transportation and Circulation

This alternative would not achieve all the benefits of the Project, as additional parking, as compared to the Project, would still occur in the surrounding neighborhoods. This alternative would result in 147 fewer spaces on regular days and 250 during special events as compared to the Project (see **Table 5-1**). The roadway improvements anticipated to occur adjacent to the ~~Project Development Site~~ would not occur, since parking area, and bus staging would still be needed on Coldwater Canyon Avenue. No pedestrian bridge would be included in this alternative Project. Rather a crosswalk would be provided at ground level. This alternative would not change the Southern Parking Lot to be a bus staging area. Rather buses would remain on Coldwater Canyon Avenue and parking would remain in the Southern Parking Lot.

Parking Location	Existing Parking Supply	Project Parking Supply (Regular Day and Special Events*)	Alternative 3 Parking (Regular Day and Special Events)	Change Alternative 3 to Existing
On-Campus	578	335 (+ 103 for special events) <u>438</u>	438	-140
Parking Structure	0	750	500	+500
Total	578	1,085 (+ 103 for special events) <u>1,188</u>	938	+360

* The Project would include use of the 103 parking spaces in the Southern Parking Lot for Special Events.

It is anticipated that there would be increased delays associated with having sufficient green time to allow pedestrians to cross Coldwater Canyon Avenue. In addition there would be safety concerns related to children crossing this major thoroughfare along with substantial bus activity in the immediate vicinity of the crossing. Impacts would be greater than the Project but still less than significant.

An analysis was prepared using the signalized intersection analysis methodology provided in the *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM) published by the Transportation Research Board to quantify the changes in motorist delay associated with Alternative 3. Unlike the City's ~~Critical Movement Analysis~~ (CMA) signalized intersection methodology, the HCM methodology allows for consideration of: 1) the presence of pedestrian

phasing, and 2) the number of pedestrians crossing a street. For the Project, the pedestrian bridge allows for grade-separated pedestrian movement across Coldwater Canyon Avenue; no separate pedestrian phase is needed to facilitate pedestrian movements across Coldwater Canyon Avenue at the main driveway intersection as at-grade pedestrian crossings would be prohibited.

To evaluate Alternative 3 (no pedestrian bridge), the HCM analysis was used to evaluate the Coldwater Canyon Avenue/main driveway intersection during the AM and PM peak hours based on: 1) the Proposed Project, and 2) ~~with~~ Alternative 3. The HCM analysis incorporated the reduction in traffic signal green time allocated for Coldwater Canyon Avenue, as additional traffic signal time would be needed to allow pedestrians to cross Coldwater Canyon Avenue. Also, based on the anticipated usage of the ~~parking structure~~ Parking Structure, it was assumed that approximately 400 pedestrians would cross Coldwater Canyon Avenue during the peak hour (AM and PM).⁸

The HCM analysis considers the additional vehicle delays as motorists exiting the Harvard-Westlake Campus on the east side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue and the Proposed Parking Structure would be required to wait for the crosswalk to clear prior to turning from these driveways onto Coldwater Canyon Avenue. **Table 5-2** provides a summary of the HCM analysis prepared for the Coldwater Canyon Avenue/main driveway intersection. As shown in Column [2], for conditions with the Project (with pedestrian bridge), the intersection is forecast under the HCM methodology to operate at LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS E D during the PM peak hour. Column [3] of **Table 5-2** provides the results of the HCM analysis for Alternative 3 (no Pedestrian Bridge). As shown, the intersection would degrade to LOS C during the AM peak hour and would worsen to ~~the~~ LOS E F during the PM peak hour. More specifically, when comparing Alternative 3 to the Project, **Table 5-2** shows that the average motorist delay increases by approximately 12 seconds during the AM peak hour and ~~39~~ 46 seconds during the PM peak hour.

No.	Intersection	Peak Hr.	CMA Analysis (b)		HCM Analysis (c)				Change in Delay [(3) - (2)]
			[1]		[2]		[3]		
			Future (2016 2019) with Project	Future (2016 2019) with Project	Future (2016 2019) with Project	Future (2016 2019) with Alternative 43			
	(a)	V/C	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS		
5	Coldwater Canyon Ave./Harvard-Westlake Driveway	AM	0.419 <u>0.446</u>	A	12.6 <u>12.9</u>	B	25.0 <u>25.3</u>	C	12.4
		PM	0.967 <u>1.031</u>	E <u>F</u>	30.1 <u>39.4</u>	E <u>D</u>	68.9 <u>85.0</u>	E <u>F</u>	38.8 <u>45.6</u>

(a) AM and PM peak hour analysis based on peak hour of traffic on Coldwater Canyon Avenue coinciding with the student arrival and departure period at Harvard-Westlake School (7:15 AM to 8:15 AM and 2:45 PM to 3:45 PM).
 (b) ~~Critical Movement Analysis (CMA)~~ from Traffic Study.
 (c) ~~Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)~~ used to evaluate changes in intersection operations with and without proposed pedestrian bridge.
 (d) Project alternative does not include a pedestrian bridge connecting the Proposed Parking Structure to the Harvard-Westlake Campus on the east side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue. Therefore, pedestrians/students must walk across Coldwater Canyon Avenue at-grade between the Parking Structure and the Harvard-Westlake Campus on the east side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue.
 SOURCE: LLG, 2015

⁸ Assuming 280 cars would enter the garage in the am peak hour, with an occupancy rate of 1.42 people per car. The Harvard-Westlake School's afternoon peak (when the Harvard-Westlake School lets out) would be less (211 vehicles exiting).

Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

This alternative would meet many of the Project objectives but not to the same extent as the Project. Since it would not provide the same amount of parking (one third less than the Project), some of the parking impacts on the adjacent neighborhood that would be removed by the Project would continue to occur under this alternative. It would not meet the objective relating to enhancing playing practice field facilities, to increase opportunities for recreational activities on Campus. In addition, this alternative would not accommodate the relocation of school bus loading and unloading onto the Harvard-Westlake Campus Southern Lot as the Southern Lot would be required for vehicle parking. A street-level crossing would raise safety concerns for children crossing this major roadway.

Conclusion

Alternative 3 would have fewer impacts as compared to the Proposed Project. Construction noise impacts would remain significant but could be incrementally reduced (in duration, but not intensity) compared to the Project. ~~The significant construction air quality impacts would be similar to the Project since the air quality impacts are mainly associated with excavation, which would be the same under the Project and Alternative 3.~~ Aesthetic and lighting impacts would be less than the Project since there would be no athletic practice field and therefore no lighting impacts. Biological impacts, including significant impacts to two sensitive species and significant cumulative impacts to the oak-walnut woodland and associated species, would be the same as the Project. While overall impacts would be less, this alternative would not fully meet Project objectives to provide parking, improve circulation and safety and would not meet the objective to enhance playing practice field facilities, to increase opportunities for recreational activities on Campus.

ALTERNATIVE 4 – SMALLER FOOTPRINT PARKING STRUCTURE, NO ATHLETIC PRACTICE FIELD, ROOFTOP PARKING

Description of Alternative

This alternative would reduce the footprint of the Parking Structure and would include four stories (five levels) of parking including rooftop parking rather than an athletic practice field. It would include the same number of parking spaces (750 spaces) and the pedestrian bridge would remain. This alternative would not include an athletic practice field or the associated lights. This alternative would include low-level security lighting on the top deck. This alternative would include a Pedestrian Bridge pedestrian bridge as with the Project. **Figure 5-4** shows an aerial photograph with a rendering of Alternative 4; **Figure 5-5** shows a street level view of Alternative 4.

Impact Comparison

Aesthetics/Views/Lighting

Visual Quality. Impacts to aesthetic character would be similar or potentially greater than the Project as the massing of the structure would result in less frontage along Coldwater Canyon Avenue but a taller structure (four stories and five levels as compared to three stories and four levels for the Project). ~~But~~ This alternative would not include the rooftop netting, —But it would include rooftop lights, but although the lighting would be in the middle of the structure rather than along the edges. Views of a green practice field as viewed from some homes may be preferred over views of parked cars. Overall, impacts would be similar to the Project and would remain less than significant.



SOURCE: IDG Parkitects, Inc.

Harvard-Westlake Parking Structure ■

Figure 5-3

Alternative 4 -- Smaller Footprint



SOURCE: IDG Parkitects, Inc.

Harvard-Westlake Parking Structure ■

Figure 5-4

Alternative 4 -- Smaller Footprint Rendering of Street Level View

Views. The structure would be visible in similar views as the Project. While there would be no netting enclosure of the field there would be an additional building story. The pedestrian bridge across Coldwater Canyon Avenue (a designated scenic highway in the City of Los Angeles) would still be included in this alternative. Substantial landscaping and mitigation of impacts to trees would continue to occur. Impacts would be similar to the Project and would remain less than significant.

Lighting. There would be lighting impacts associated with the security lighting of parked cars, but there would be no nighttime lighting of an athletic practice field atop the structure. Security lighting for parked cars and car headlights would be visible from some adjacent homes and the adjacent open space area. Impacts would be less as compared to the Project and would continue to be less than significant.

Air Quality

Construction. The amount of grading and construction would be less due to the smaller footprint of the structure (approximately 25% smaller footprint resulting in approximately 25% less grading); however, the significant As with the Project, air quality impacts related to grading would remain since daily construction operations would be the same or similar to the Project and less than significant (although the duration would be less). Overall, construction impacts to air quality could be less than the Project since construction duration could be shortened as compared to the Project as a result of the smaller footprint. As for the Project, impacts would be less than significant.

Operation. Operational air quality emissions at the Development Site would be the same as the Project as there would be the same number of parking spaces. As for the Project impacts would be less than significant.

Biological Resources

Trees. This alternative would result in impacts to approximately 20% to 30% fewer trees as compared to the Project since the building footprint would be less thereby impacting a smaller area. However, a debris basin would still be required. The same mitigation measures would be required as for the Project. Although the area of impact would be smaller, conservatively, as for the Project, impacts would be considered significant with respect to loss of oak-walnut woodland resulting in specific impacts to sensitive species (San Bernardino ringneck snake and coastal western whiptail) and a cumulatively considerable contribution to loss of oak-walnut woodland habitat and other sensitive species.

Birds and Other Native Species. This alternative would result in fewer impacts to biological resources as compared to the Project since the building footprint would be less thereby impacting a smaller area. The same mitigation measures would be required as for the Project. Although the area of impact would be smaller, conservatively, impacts to oak/walnut woodland and associated species are considered to be the same as the Project -- Project-specific impacts to sensitive species (San Bernardino ringneck snake and coastal western whiptail) and a cumulatively considerable contribution to loss of oak-walnut woodland habitat and other sensitive species that forage on the Development Site on occasion.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would result in less area of disturbance. Therefore impacts would be less than the Project and would continue to be less than significant.

Geology, Soils and Hydrology

Grading. This alternative would result in fewer impacts to grading (approximately 107,000 cubic yards of grading and 102,000 cubic yards of export as compared to ~~135,000~~ the conservative 140,000 cubic yards of

grading and export under the Project) since the building footprint would be smaller and less grading would be required. Therefore, impacts would be less than the Project and would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Seismicity. The same number of parking spaces on the Development Site would result in the same population exposed to on-site geologic hazards for parking, but the population associated with ~~athletic practice~~ activities would not be present (they would remain on the Harvard-Westlake Campus). Therefore impacts would be less than the Project, and would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Hydrology. Similarly ~~to this~~ alternative would result in less impact to hydrology as compared to the Project since the area of impermeable surfaces would be less due to the smaller building footprint. As for the Project, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Water Quality. Impacts to water quality would be similar to the Project since the same number of cars would be parked on the Development Site. The ~~athletic practice~~ field would not be present ~~there~~ and therefore any minor impacts to water quality that could result from these activities would not occur. As with the Project, compliance with the LID Ordinance would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Land Use and Planning

Compatibility with Adjacent Uses. This alternative would result in fewer impacts to land use as compared to the Project as the footprint would be smaller and the massing of the building would be less. Impacts would remain less than significant as for the Project.

Consistency with Plans. This alternative would continue to provide a parking use on the ~~site~~ Development Site and would still require the approval of a conditional use permit resulting in similar impacts as compared to the Project. Impacts would remain less than significant as for the Project.

Noise

Construction. As this alternative would reduce the amount of grading ~~and construction~~, the duration of construction noise impacts associated with grading would be less but would remain significant. However, the anticipated construction noise impact associated with building the structure would be similar to that of the Project, and would remain significant (i.e. significant), but potentially for a longer duration due to the additional level of parking (although over a smaller area).

Operation. Operational noise impacts could be less than the Project as there would be no ~~athletic practice~~ field atop the Parking Structure. However, this alternative would include rooftop parking that would result in noise from vehicles (including car horns, alarms and slamming doors) particularly at the start and end of the school day, which could annoy some adjacent residents. Nonetheless, as for the Project, operational noise impacts likely would be less than significant.

Transportation and Circulation

This alternative would provide the same parking as the Project and would include similar roadway improvements. Impacts would be the same as for the Project and less than significant.

Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

This alternative would meet the Project objectives related to parking and safety, but would not meet the objective related ~~but not~~ to enhancing ~~playing practice~~ field facilities to increase opportunities for recreational activities on Campus.

Conclusion

Alternative 4 would have fewer impacts as compared to the Proposed Project. Construction noise impacts would remain significant but could be incrementally reduced (in duration, but not intensity) compared to the Project due to decreased grading. Although the area of impact would be smaller, conservatively, impacts to oak-walnut woodland and associated species are considered to be the same as the Project -- Project-specific impacts to sensitive species (San Bernardino ringneck snake and coastal western whiptail) and a cumulatively considerable contribution to loss of oak-walnut woodland habitat and other sensitive species that forage on the Development Site on occasion. The rooftop would be occupied by parking cars rather than ~~an athletic practice field~~ thus eliminating noise associated with athletic activities, but adding noise associated with parking and parked cars (alarms, slamming doors etc.) which could be annoying to some adjacent residents. ~~The significant~~ As for the Project, construction air quality impacts would be less than significant; impacts under this alternative would be of less duration than the Project since less excavation would be needed. Aesthetic and lighting impacts would be less than the Project since there would be no ~~athletic practice field~~ although there would be lighting impacts from low-level security lighting on the rooftop as well as lights from car headlights. While impacts would be less, this alternative would not meet the Project objective to enhance ~~playing practice~~ field facilities and to increase opportunities for recreational activities on Campus.

ALTERNATIVE 5 – EAST SIDE OF COLDWATER CANYON AVENUE – SOUTHERN PARKING LOT, NO PRACTICE FIELD, ROOFTOP PARKING

Description of Alternative

This alternative assumes that a 750-space parking structure would be constructed on the east side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue on the Southern Parking Lot. The structure would be 10 stories plus rooftop parking. There are 103 spaces in the Southern Parking Lot that would be displaced by a parking structure at this location. Under the Proposed Project, these spaces are proposed to be displaced and bus staging is proposed to be located on this lot. Under this alternative, bus staging would remain on Coldwater Canyon Avenue. Given space constraints this alternative would not be able to include ~~an athletic practice field~~. No pedestrian bridge across Coldwater Canyon Avenue would be needed under this alternative. The walnut trees (~~271~~ 273 trees) on the Development Site would continue to die as part of the natural cycle of tree death and regrowth. **Figure 5-4** shows an aerial photograph with a rendering of Alternative 5. **Figure 5-5** shows a rendering of Alternative 5 looking north along Coldwater Canyon Avenue. **Figure 5-6** shows a rendering of Alternative 5 looking south along Coldwater Canyon Avenue.

Impact Comparison

The following environmental impacts would be expected under the East Side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue – Southern Parking Lot Alternative.



SOURCE: IDG Parkitects, Inc.

Harvard-Westlake Parking Structure ■

Figure 5-5

Alternative 5 -- East Side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue -- Southern Lot



SOURCE: IDG Parkitects, Inc.

Harvard-Westlake Parking Structure ■

Figure 5-6

Alternative 5 -- Rendering Looking North Along Coldwater Canyon Avenue



SOURCE: IDG Parkitects, Inc.

Harvard-Westlake Parking Structure ■

Figure 5-7

Alternative 5 -- Rendering Looking South Along Coldwater Canyon Avenue

Aesthetics/Views/Lighting

Visual Quality. Due to the configuration of this parking lot, the structure would be 10 stories (plus a level of rooftop parking) in order to include all the parking spaces included in the Proposed Project. A 10-story structure would be out of scale with other development on the ~~campus~~ Harvard-Westlake Campus and with the adjacent church. The Development Site would remain in its existing condition, in time it is likely that the Development Site would degrade as walnut trees die and are not replaced. (Under the Proposed Project, removal of ~~all Protected Trees~~ protected trees would be mitigated at a ratio of 4:1.) Therefore, impacts would be greater than the Project and potentially significant, compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Views. Views of the ~~campus~~ Harvard-Westlake Campus would change. The new structure would be 10 stories (plus a level of rooftop parking) and would contrast with other development on-Campus. It would dominate views from along Coldwater Canyon Avenue in the immediate vicinity of the Harvard-Westlake Campus and from homes that overlook the Harvard-Westlake Campus. Views of the proposed Development Site would remain as at present. ~~Impacts~~ Therefore, impacts would be greater than the Project and potentially significant, compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Lighting. There would be low-level security lighting of the structure. Cars could be parked on the rooftop, so there would be some lighting associated with the car headlights as well as security lighting atop the structure (similar to the security lighting that currently occurs on the lot but at a higher elevation). There would be no new lighting on the Development Site as would occur under the Project. Lighting of the Campus could incrementally increase as compared to ~~at the present~~, but no new ~~athletic practice~~ field lighting would occur. The lighting atop the structure would be visible to neighbors in the area particularly to the east. However, as with the Project, direct spillover lighting greater than the City standard of 2 footcandles would not occur. Therefore, impacts would be similar to the Project and less than significant.

Air Quality

Construction. Construction air quality impacts would be less than the Project, as this alternative would require much less excavation of soil (1,950 cubic yards as compared to conservatively 140,000 cubic yards with the Project). The structure would hold the same number of cars as the Project but would be taller than under the Project, therefore construction of the structure could take longer. However, overall construction air emissions would be less than the Project due to less grading (9 months of grading and truck activity would not occur) under this alternative (although daily emissions might be similar, ~~and potentially significant~~). Alternative 4 air quality impacts would be less than significant, as for the Project.

Operation. Improvements to Coldwater Canyon Avenue that would occur under the Project would not occur under this alternative. Bus operations would continue to occur on Coldwater Canyon Avenue. Air quality impacts from operations ~~Operational impacts~~ would be the same as the Project (less than significant) ~~less than significant as they are~~ and comparable to today.

Biological Resources

Trees. Approximately 15 to 25 ornamental trees on-campus would be impacted by development of the parking structure. Mitigation measures related to replacing trees and protecting birds would be required as are required in the ~~proposed~~ Project. There would be no impacts to the Development Site. The walnut trees on the Development Site would continue to die as part of the natural cycle of tree death and regrowth. Retention of the native landscaping on the Development Site would result in fewer impacts to biological resources as

compared to the Project. Impacts to oak/walnut woodland would be less than significant under this alternative as compared to the Project's cumulatively significant impact on oak/walnut woodland.

Birds and Other Native Species. This alternative would result in fewer impacts to biological resources as compared to the Project since the building would be built on an existing parking lot across the street from the Development Site. The same mitigation measures would be required as for the Project. Impacts to birds and other native species would be less than significant under this alternative as compared to the Project's significant impact on two sensitive species and cumulatively significant impact on sensitive species associated with oak/walnut woodland.

Cultural Resources

The Harvard-Westlake Campus would have the same potential for finding resources as the Project. The area of the campus has already been disturbed, although this alternative could involve excavation below levels previously impacted. Therefore, the impacts would be the same as the Project and less than significant.

Geology, Soils and Hydrology

Grading. This location would require approximately 1,950 cubic yards of cut and fill but no export as compared to ~~135,000~~ conservatively 140,000 cubic yards of grading and export under the Proposed Project. There would be no grading of the Development Site. Therefore, impacts would be less than for the Project and would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Seismicity. A geotechnical report would be required to identify appropriate construction techniques for this location. Impacts would be similar to the Project and less than significant with mitigation.

Hydrology. The Harvard-Westlake Campus is already developed and the ~~parking lot~~ Southern Parking Lot is already covered with impervious surfaces therefore hydrologic impacts are not anticipated. Minimal erosion could occur as a result of construction activity. Impacts would be less than the Project and would remain less than significant.

Water Quality. There could be impacts to water quality on the site as a result of construction activity, but required storm water mitigation would reduce such impacts to less than significance. Compliance with the LID ordinance would reduce operational impacts to less than significant. Impacts would be less than the Project as this area of the Harvard-Westlake Campus is already used for parking. As for the project, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Land Use and Planning

Compatibility with Adjacent Uses. Land uses on the ~~campus~~ Harvard-Westlake Campus would intensify. A 10 story (plus rooftop parking) parking structure on the Southern Parking Lot would increase activity on this part of the Harvard-Westlake Campus, but the use would remain the same and would be compatible with adjacent uses (many of the adjacent homes are owned by Harvard-Westlake School). As for the Project impacts would be less than significant.

The Development Site would remain in its present condition. There would be no change in land use from a vacant site to a parking garage and practice field. Impacts to land use would therefore be less than the Project, and less than significant as for the Project.

Consistency with Plans. This alternative would require a Plan Approval under the deemed approved CUP conditional use permit for the Harvard-Westlake School. Impacts would be less than the Project since this

part of the Harvard-Westlake Campus is already in use for parking. Impacts would be less than significant as for the Project.

Noise

Construction. Construction noise would occur on-campus and while the location would change, construction noise impacts are anticipated to be significant and unavoidable under this alternative as with the Project. Impacts to St. Michael's Church (which includes the Sunnyside Preschool) would be greater under this alternative due to the proximity of the parking garage. Building construction impacts would be ~~different but likely~~ similar in intensity but of longer duration because of the increased height, under this alternative, although the 9 months of grading required for the Project would not be necessary. Therefore, overall, construction noise impacts would be less than the Project but would remain significant.

Operation. Without an ~~athletic~~ practice field, operational noise impacts could be less than the Project. But noise associated with the parking structure, especially from cars on the rooftop could impact adjacent uses. Noise levels on the Development Site would remain as at present. Impacts would be different but potentially similar to the Project.

Transportation and Circulation

Construction traffic would be substantially less since no export of soil would be required. During construction, the 103 parking spaces in the Southern Parking Lot would be displaced resulting in increased parking on surrounding neighborhood streets. Upon completion of the parking structure, off-site parking would no longer occur during normal operations; there would be 1,225 spaces on-campus. **Table 5-3** shows parking on completion of Alternative 5.

Parking Location	Existing Parking Supply	Project Parking Supply (Regular Day and Special Events*)	Alternative 5 Parking (Regular Day and Special Events)	Change Alternative 5 to Existing
On-Campus	578	335 (+ 103 for special events) <u>438</u>	1,225	+647
Parking Structure	0	750	In above	In above
Total	578	1,085 (+ 103 for special events) <u>1,188</u>	1,225	+647

* The Project would include use of the 103 parking spaces in the Southern Parking Lot for Special Events.

Circulation improvements to bus staging proposed under the Project would not occur in this alternative. Traffic improvements adjacent to the Project Site ~~may~~ would not occur, and school bus operations would continue to occur along Coldwater Canyon Avenue instead of on the Harvard-Westlake Campus. Therefore, impacts of this alternative would be somewhat greater than the Project since bus operations would remain on Coldwater Canyon Avenue, but less than significant compared to existing conditions, since there would be no change. Project impacts would also be less than significant.

Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

This alternative would not meet Project objectives to the same extent as the Project. During construction, school-related vehicles would continue to park on-street, either on Coldwater Canyon Avenue or in the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Circulation and safety in the vicinity would not be improved, as

school buses would continue to park and load/unload students on Coldwater Canyon Avenue. The flow of traffic on Coldwater Canyon Avenue would not be improved since the improvements proposed under the Project would not be constructed. Finally, there would be no increased opportunities for recreational activities on Harvard-Westlake Campus since the ~~proposed athletic practice~~ field would not be constructed. Thus, this alternative would not meet the Project objectives.

Conclusion

This alternative would not meet Project objectives related to improved circulation and enhanced ~~athletic practice~~ fields and recreational opportunities. Protected trees (walnuts) on the Development Site would continue to die (from the infectious ~~fungus disease~~ TCD) without being replaced outside of the natural cycle of tree death and regrowth. Traffic improvements along Coldwater Canyon Avenue adjacent to the Project Site would not be implemented, school buses would continue to load and unload students along Coldwater Canyon Avenue. The On-Campus – Southern Parking Lot alternative would reduce or avoid some of the environmental impacts that would occur under the Project (including significant impacts to two sensitive species and cumulative impacts as a result of loss of oak/walnut woodland), but significant construction noise and ~~air quality~~ impacts would remain.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Table 5-4 summarizes a comparison of impacts between the Proposed Project and the identified alternatives. Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the analyzed alternatives. When the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, another environmentally superior alternative shall be identified from among the remaining alternatives. From a strictly environmental standpoint, the No Project Alternative is environmentally superior to the Proposed Project.

Between the remaining alternatives, each alternative reduces some environmental impacts as compared to the Project. Alternative 2 would result in incrementally fewer significant construction noise impacts because 4 residential homes would have less building area than the Parking Structure and therefore ~~fewer air emissions and~~ shorter duration of construction activities. It is also anticipated that construction of four new homes would not result in the impacts to biological resources -- significant impacts to two sensitive species and cumulative impacts as a result of loss of oak/walnut woodland. All other ~~significant~~, less than significant, and significant but mitigated environmental impacts would be less than under the Project. Therefore, Alternative 2 is identified as the environmentally superior alternative. However, none of the Project objectives would be achieved under Alternative 2.

TABLE 5-4: SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS -- PROJECT COMPARED TO EACH ALTERNATIVE						
Environmental Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Existing Zoning – 4 homes	Alternative 3 Two-Level Structure, No Athletic Practice Field, No Lights, No Pedestrian Bridge.	Alternative 4 Smaller Footprint Parking Structure, No Athletic Practice Field, Rooftop Parking	Alternate 5 East Side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue – Southern Parking Lot, No Practice Field, Rooftop Parking
AESTHETICS						
Character, Views, Light and Glare	Less than significant with mitigation.	No impact.	Less Less than Significant	Less. Less than significant with mitigation.	Less (smaller footprint, smaller structure, no athletic practice field lights)	Greater – views and character. Building would be 10 stories (11 levels) and out of scale with adjacent church. Potentially significant. Less -- lighting; there would be no athletic practice field and no lights.
AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS						
Construction	Significant and unavoidable at six residences. Less than significant with mitigation.	No impact.	Less. Less than significant.	Comparable. Significant impact associated with grading remains. Construction reduced in duration. Less than significant with mitigation.	Less (grading reduced), but impact would remain significant. Less than significant with mitigation.	Comparable. Significant impact associated with grading remains. Construction potentially reduced in duration. Less than significant with mitigation.
Operation	Less than significant.	No impact.	Greater. Less than significant.	Similar. Less than significant.	Similar. Less than significant.	Similar. Less than significant.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Less than significant.	No impact.	Less. Less than significant.	Less. Less than significant.	Less. Less than significant.	Less. Less than significant.
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES						
Birds	Less than significant with mitigation (except sensitive foraging birds associated with oak-walnut woodland; see impact below.)	No impact.	Less. Approximately 50% fewer trees to be removed. Less than significant.	Same Less. Same number of 5% to 10% fewer trees impacted. Less than significant with mitigation except as noted below.	Less. 20% to 30% fewer trees impacted (less area disturbed). Less than significant except as noted below.	Less (loss of 15 to 25 ornamental trees). Less than significant with mitigation.
Trees	429 147 protected trees removed, 26 20 encroached upon. Less than significant with mitigation.	No impact.	Less. Less than significant.	Same Comparable. Less than significant with mitigation.	Less (less area, fewer trees disturbed). Less than significant with mitigation.	Few if any protected trees would be lost. Less than significant.

TABLE 5-4: SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS -- PROJECT COMPARED TO EACH ALTERNATIVE

Environmental Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Existing Zoning – 4 homes	Alternative 3 Two-Level Structure, No Athletic Practice Field, No Lights, No Pedestrian Bridge.	Alternative 4 Smaller Footprint Parking Structure, No Athletic Practice Field, Rooftop Parking	Alternate 5 East Side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue – Southern Parking Lot, No Practice Field, Rooftop Parking
Oak/walnut woodland and associated species	<u>Significant impact on two sensitive (not listed) reptiles. Cumulative impact on oak/walnut woodland habitat and associated sensitive species.</u>	No impact.	Less (less area disturbed). Less than significant.	<u>Same. Significant.</u>	<u>Similar. Significant.</u>	<u>Less. Less than significant.</u>
CULTURAL RESOURCES (ARCHAEOLOGICAL, PALEONTOLOGICAL AND HUMAN REMAINS)						
Archeological, Paleontological and Human Remains Resources.	Low potential for occurrence. Less than significant.	No impact.	Less (less area disturbed). Less than significant.	Same. Less than significant.	Less (smaller area disturbed). Less than significant.	Similar. Less than significant.
GEOLOGY, SOILS AND HYDROLOGY (INCLUDING STORM WATER DRAINAGE)						
Grading	135,000 Conservatively 140,000 cy export. Less than significant with mitigation.	No impact.	Less (35,250 cy grading, 10,250 cy export). Less than significant.	Same. Less (129,000 cy grading, 123,000 cy export). Less than significant with mitigation.	Less (107,000 cy grading, 102,000 cy export). Less than significant.	Less (1,950 cy cut and fill). Less than significant with mitigation.
Seismic	Less than significant with mitigation.	No impact.	Less. Less than significant.	Less. Less than significant with mitigation.	Comparable. Less than significant with mitigation.	Comparable. Less than significant with mitigation.
Hydrology	Less than significant with mitigation.	No impact.	Less. Less than significant.	Same. Less. Less than Significant with mitigation.	Less (less area impacted). Less than significant with mitigation.	Less Less than Significant with mitigation.
Water Quality	Less than significant with mitigation.	No impact.	Less Less than significant.	Less. Less than Significant with mitigation.	Comparable. Less than significant with mitigation.	Less Less than significant with mitigation.
LAND USE						
Consistency with Adjacent Uses	Less than significant.	No impact.	Less. Less than significant.	Different Similar. Less than significant.	Comparable. Less than significant.	Less. Less than significant.
Consistency with Plans	Less than significant.	No impact.	Less. Less than significant.	Greater. Less than significant.	Comparable. Less than significant.	Less. Less than significant.
NOISE						
Construction	Significant and unavoidable for adjacent residences.	No impact.	Less. Less than significant	Less. Duration of grading would be less, but noise levels would remain significant.	Less. Duration of grading would be less, but noise levels would remain significant.	Different location, construction noise impacts remain significant and unavoidable but shorter duration.

TABLE 5-4: SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS -- PROJECT COMPARED TO EACH ALTERNATIVE						
Environmental Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Existing Zoning – 4 homes	Alternative 3 Two-Level Structure, No Athletic Practice Field, No Lights, No Pedestrian Bridge.	Alternative 4 Smaller Footprint Parking Structure, No Athletic Practice Field, Rooftop Parking	Alternate 5 East Side of Coldwater Canyon Avenue – Southern Parking Lot, No Practice Field, Rooftop Parking
Operation	Less than significant.	No impact.	Greater Less than significant	Less Less than significant	Comparable/different. Less than significant.	Comparable/different. Less than significant.
TRANSPORTATION, CIRCULATION AND PARKING						
Traffic	No impact.	No impact.	Greater. Less than significant	Greater. Less than significant	Same. Less than significant.	Greater. Less than significant.

Bolded indicates significant impact.