As a result, this alternatives analysis focuses on those development options that could **bre**plemented and which, if implem**tend**, would have the potential to reduce or avoid any significant adverse environtanteerffects associated with the proposed project.

Although CEQA Guidelines direct lead agencies to interest the feasibility of one or more alternate locations, that alternative is not required: "if the agency concludes that no feasible alternative location exists," however, "it must disclose the reasons in the EIR." Two alternatives to the proposed projectre identified for study in this EIR.

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative asses that the proposed project would not be implemented. The No Project Alteinventallows decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts not approving the proposed project, and does not mean that development on the project site will be implicated. The No Project lternative includes "what would be reasonably expected to occur in the forestee that 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, atsnet 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 campuisdings 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 prosed 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 signification pate to 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 pass marquee signs would be dimmed to a 400 footlamberts (fl) level of illumination under Alternative 2 imilar 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 undarble significant impact related to spillover light from the proposed illuminated marquee signs onto adjacesidential properties locD .0 to spilnorth and sout -23.7

taha 2009-037 5-2