¹ As a result, this alternatives analysis focuses on those development options that could be plemented and which, if implemented, would have the potential to reduce or avoid any significant adverse environt and effects associated with the proposed project.

Although CEQA Guidelines direct lead agencies to **iden**sthe feasibility of one or more alternate locations, that alternative is not required: "if **these**d agency concludes that no feasible alternative location exists," however, "it must disclose the reas**fons** his conclusion and should include the reasons in the EIR."² Two alternatives to the proposed projective identified for study in this EIR.

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative assess that the proposed project would not be implemented. The No Project Alteinmentallows decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts stot approving the proposed project, and does not mean that development on the project site will be high ited. The No Project Alternative includes "what would be reasonably expected to occur in the fore see feature if the project were not approved, based

Alternative 2: Substitute Campus Marquees Alternative The Substitute Campus Marquees Alternative assumes that the three campus marqueets utilize an illuminated display that could be dimmed to a 400 foot-lamberts (fl) level of illumination allowable light intensity of the illuminated signs within 100 feet of residential properties, atisned in the Monterey Park Municipal Code Section 21.50.070, Sign Regulations, General Requirements of the other components of the proposed project would be implemented under the Substitute Campus Marquees Alternative.

5.3 ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

Aesthetics and Lighting

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative. The project site aesthetics and lighting would remain unchanged under Alternative 1nd the aesthetic improvements to the campus, which include new facilities, modernizations and renovations to campuiddings and facilities and the addition of open space associated with the proposed athletic fields, would not be realized. Potential light and glare impacts resulting from exterior security lighting for the proged parking structure and vehicle headlights in the parking structure onto the adjacent residential buildtogs north the project site would not occur under Alternative 1. Likewise, the unavoidable significampact related to spillover light from the proposed illuminated marquee signs onto adjacent residential pricepto the north and south of the project site would not occur under Alternative 1. Alternative 1 would result in no impacts to aesthetics and lighting.

Alternative 2: Substitute Campus Marquees Alternative Under Alternative 2, the aesthetic improvements to the campus (i.e., the new facilities dernizations and rendivans to campus building and facilities and the addition of open space associated the proposed athletic fields) would be implemented. However, the three illuminated page marquee signs would be dimmed to a 400 foot-lamberts (fl) level of illumination under Alternative Similar to the proposed project, potential light and glare impacts resulting from exterior security light for the proposed parking structure and vehicle headlights in the parking structure onto the adjacesidential buildings to the north the project site would occur under Alternative 2. However, the undable significant impact related to spillover light from the proposed illuminated marquee signs onto adjacesidential properties located to the north and south of the project site would not occur under Alternative 2. Alternative 2 would result in less-thansignificant impacts to aesthetics and lighting.

Air Quality

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative. Alternative 1 would not incide any additional construction activity beyond what was previously authorized untile Final EIR and subspect addendums, and no construction emissions would generated. Therefore, Alternativ would not result in construction air quality impacts. However, under the No Project Alterive, student enrollment would be expected to continue to increase similar to the proposed epotoj Therefore, as motor vehicles trips are the predominate source of long-term project emission previously emissions would still exceed the SCAQMD regional significance threshold for NQ and localized significance thresholds for PM and PM₁₀. Alternative 1 would result in an unavolute significant operational air quality impact.

Alternative 2: Substitute Campus Marquees Alternative Alternative 2 would include a similar amount of construction activity as the proposed projecterefore, localized construction emissions and operational air quality impacts would be similar to proposed project under Alternative 2, Alternative 2 would result in an unavoidable significant air quality impact.