

5.0 ALTERNATIVES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15126.6 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the identification and evaluation of reasonable alternatives designed to feasibly achieve the most basic objectives of the project, while avoiding or substantially lessening any of the significant environmental effects of the project. In addition, CEQA requires a comparative evaluation of the merits of the alternatives.

Pursuant to Section 15126.6 (f)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives include, but are not limited to, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). Although these factors do not present a strict limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives to be considered, they help establish the context in which “the rule of reason” is measured against when determining an appropriate range of alternatives sufficient to establish and foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making. This Section of the EIR conforms to the CEQA Guidelines, as amended February 1, 2001.

The basic objectives of the proposed General Plan Update and General Plan EIR are set forth specifically and in detail in Section 3.3 of this EIR, and are restated as follows.

- ❑ Update the City’s environmental baseline conditions to the year 2001.
- ❑ Addition of new goals and policies based upon the new planning factors established for the General Plan Update.
- ❑ Update the General Plan development projections for the year 2020, including projections for dwelling units, non-residential square footage, population and employment.
- ❑ Conform with Section 21000 et. seq. of CEQA, which requires that environmental impacts be addressed and mitigated.
- ❑ Prepare and certify a General Plan EIR (Program EIR) that will serve as a first tier environmental document, consistent with the requirements of Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines.
- ❑ Provide a basis for informative decisions when considering the 2020 development associated with implementation of the General Plan in the City of Cerritos.

- Provide a legally defensible environmental foundation upon which decisions may be evaluated and justified.

The potentially significant impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed General Plan Update are set forth in Section 4.0 of this EIR. The proposed General Plan Update would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with regard to:

- Transportation/Circulation;
- Air Quality; and
- Schools.

Implementation of the identified policies or mitigation measures can mitigate all other potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. This section considers alternatives to otherwise avoid or minimize these impacts.

The following alternatives have been identified for detailed analysis in this section:

- No Project/No Development; and
- Existing General Plan.

The analysis of alternatives includes the assumption that all applicable policies or mitigation measures associated with the proposed General Plan Update would be implemented with the Existing General Plan Alternative. A description of each alternative and a comparative environmental evaluation to the impacts identified for the proposed General Plan Update is provided below.

5.2 NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT

5.2.1 DESCRIPTION

Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that no additional development would occur; thus, the City would maintain the status quo of existing land use conditions and levels of development in the City of Cerritos. Any development that would occur as part of buildout of the proposed General Plan Update would not occur under this Alternative. By definition, this Alternative prohibits the issuance of any further building permits. This situation would void the implementation of any current or future General Plan for the City of Cerritos, and would therefore be in direct conflict with California statutes requiring General Plans, the Subdivision Map Act, and the rights of land owners to develop their property.

5.2.2 IMPACT EVALUATION

The following impact evaluation provides a comparison between the existing land use conditions and levels of development, which would remain unchanged with the No

Project/No Development Alternative, and those associated with the proposed General Plan Update. An analysis is provided for each of the impact areas identified in this EIR. The evaluation is followed by a conclusion.

LAND USE

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in any changes to existing land uses or development levels within the City of Cerritos. Under this Alternative, the 26.62 acres of vacant land would remain undeveloped. The vacant land is within an established urban area and represents an opportunity for infill development. However, under this Alternative, infill development is not a feasible opportunity. Nor is the opportunity for “underutilized” parcels to expand the use or construct a new use on the site. Furthermore, the proposed General Plan Update would not conflict with the City’s existing plans for buildout, nor would it result in conflicts with CEQA statutes. In this regard, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

This Alternative would result in the City neglecting its obligation to maintain a current Housing Element, which must include the City’s plan for attempting to meet its share of the region’s future housing needs. Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the City of Cerritos would not develop any additional housing units, which would not allow the City to meet its quantified objectives for housing as outlined in the Housing Element. Opportunities to increase employment within the City would also be lost with this Alternative, as no additional development within the City would occur. Additionally, the population growth in the City of Cerritos expected to result from implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not result in any significant impacts. In this regard, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

AESTHETICS

The No Project/No Development Alternative would result in no net change to the landform and visual character of the area given that no development beyond existing levels would be permitted. Development standards specified in planning documents, such as adopted Specific Plans, would not be applied given that no development would be permitted under this Alternative. Thus, the aesthetic character of the City would remain the same as it exists today. In this regard, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in significant and unavoidable impacts for two roadway segments: South Street, west of Studebaker Avenue (LOS E); and South Street, between I-605 and Grindley Avenue (LOS E). These roadway segments are currently operating at LOS C and LOS D, respectively.

The City of Cerritos is surrounded by cities that currently use Cerritos' circulation system as part of their regional transportation system. Furthermore, these surrounding cities, as well as regional traffic, are anticipating future growth through the life of the General Plan, which would result in additional traffic on the City's transportation system. Under the proposed General Plan Update, the roadway segments on South Street, west of Studebaker Avenue; and South Street, between I-605 and Grindley Avenue, would operate at a LOS E, due to increases in regional traffic and traffic generated within Cerritos. Since regional traffic would be a large contributor to traffic on these roadway segments and that adjacent intersections could meet acceptable LOS standards, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

AIR QUALITY

The No Project/No Development Alternative would reduce potential air quality impacts associated with increased traffic. However, the proposed General Plan Update is intended to promote a mix of housing and employment opportunities in the City, which may reduce the number and length of vehicle trips in the region. Additionally, the proposed General Plan Update would not result in land use changes that would expose people to odorous emissions, toxic air contaminants, or other air contaminants.

Nonetheless, development of the vacant and underutilized areas anticipated with the proposed General Plan Update would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative. As a result, none of the short-term construction-related emissions resulting from the anticipated development would occur with this Alternative. Additionally, the associated stationary and mobile emissions would not occur since new uses would not be constructed and traffic volumes would not increase from new uses. The proposed General Plan Update would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality with regard to construction activities, mobile sources and stationary sources. This Alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable air quality impacts of the proposed General Plan Update. In this regard, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan Update.

NOISE

Implementation of this Alternative would result in no new development that could result in an increase in noise impacts. Potential noise impacts associated with construction,

traffic, mobile and stationary noise sources would not occur with this Alternative. Development pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update would result in additional noise from construction activities and the resulting increase in traffic associated with future development. These potential noise impacts would not occur with this Alternative since the projected growth in population/development would not occur. In this regard, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan Update.

GEOLOGIC AND SEISMIC HAZARDS

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in an increase in both population and new development (i.e., new residential, commercial, and industrial land uses). As no development would occur under this Alternative, impacts such as an increase in the number of structures/people potentially exposed to substantial adverse effects associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault or severe ground shaking would not occur. In this regard, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan Update.

HYDROLOGY AND DRAINAGE

Implementation of this Alternative would result in no new or additional development that could be impacted by potential hydrology and drainage hazards (i.e., flood hazards). The demand for the City's water supply would remain stable, since no new development would occur. Development under the proposed General Plan Update would result in a slight increase in the population of the City, resulting in a corresponding increase in the demand for water. These impacts would not occur under this Alternative. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Generally, the level of service and demand for service would remain similar to what currently exists in the City. Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to school facilities. However, most of the schools in the City are currently at or above capacity. Under this Alternative, no additional impacts to services or utilities are anticipated if no further development was to occur. In addition, this Alternative does not create additional impacts to existing overcrowded school facilities. In this regard, the No Project/No Build Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan Update.

PARKS AND RECREATION

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in the expansion of, or improvement to, the existing parks and recreation facilities. The City of Cerritos has

approximately 238 acres of parkland, including community, neighborhood and regional parks. The State of California standard for parks is 3 acres for every 1,000 residents. Currently, the City has a surplus of approximately 82 acres of parkland, and thus currently meets the State's standard. The City is approximately 99 percent built out, so there is minimal potential to acquire and develop additional parkland. The proposed General Plan Update projects an increase in population of 909 people to 53,009 by 2020. Based on the State parkland ratio of 3 acres per 1,000 people, the population increase of 909 residents would create a demand for approximately 3 acres of parkland. Given that the City currently has a surplus of 82 acres, the additional demand created by the proposed General Plan Update could be met with existing facilities. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan with regard to parks and recreation.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in the expansion or development of facilities that could impact the health and safety of Cerritos residents and employees. In addition, impacts associated with exposure to hazardous waste would be less under this Alternative than the proposed General Plan Update. However, the proposed General Plan Update would result in the implementation of policies designed to maintain public health and safety. In this regard, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Under this Alternative, impacts to existing cultural resources would be reduced from the proposed General Plan Update because no additional development would occur. In regards to cultural resources, the No Project/No Build Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan Update.

5.2.3 CONCLUSION

The No Project/No Development Alternative would result in no change to the existing conditions within the City of Cerritos. Therefore, no new or additional environmental impacts would result directly from this Alternative. However, the No Project/No Development Alternative would prevent the City of Cerritos from making needed improvements to existing properties, infrastructure, and public services. Existing conditions, under this Alternative would be maintained, but not improved.

Although the No Project/No Development Alternative fails to accomplish the project objectives, it would avoid significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed General Plan with respect to traffic/circulation, air quality and schools. Thus, the No Project/No

Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan.

5.3 EXISTING GENERAL PLAN

5.3.1 DESCRIPTION

As required by Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines, the Existing General Plan Alternative describes buildout of the City of Cerritos in accordance with existing zoning and general plan land use designations under the policies and implementing strategies of the current General Plan, adopted in 1988. This Alternative assumes that the Existing General Plan would continue to provide outdated information regarding several issues, such as City traffic conditions, land use database, community noise levels and air quality data.

This Alternative assumes that ultimate buildout of the Existing General Plan would occur. The Existing General Plan encompasses the same geographic area as that in the proposed General Plan Update. The General Plan Update proposes the following revisions to the Existing General Plan:

- Update of existing conditions, with year 2001 serving as the baseline year.
- Update of General Plan development projections to the year 2020. Update projections for population, employment, residential and non-residential development for the year 2020.
- Update of the Land Use Element, including:
 - Establishment of building intensities for all non-residential (commercial, industrial and institutional) land use categories.
- Addition of a Community Design Element.
- Addition of a Growth Management Element.
- Establishment of planning factors upon which to develop new goals and policies.
- Additions, deletions or modifications to the 1988 General Plan goals and policies.
- Amendment of the remaining General Plan Elements to reflect items 1, 2, 4 and 5, above.

The goal of the proposed General Plan Update is not to make dramatic changes to the City's existing land use policy map, but rather to quantify remaining development in a

way that can be correlated to existing uses and conditions, while at the same time capitalizing on future development and/or redevelopment potential.

5.3.2 IMPACT EVALUATION

The following impact evaluation provides a comparison between the current City of Cerritos General Plan, adopted in 1988, and the proposed General Plan Update. An analysis is provided for each of the impact areas identified in this EIR. The evaluation is followed by a conclusion.

LAND USE

The proposed General Plan Update revises the existing Land Use Element by updating the land use database, as well as establishing building intensities for all non-residential (commercial, industrial and institutional) land use categories. These standards are required by State planning law. The proposed General Plan Update would also provide updated land use data regarding Area Development Plans (ADPs). The existing General Plan identifies seven ADPs, however, as of July 2003, there were 12 ADPs within the City. Therefore, under the Existing General Plan Alternative, the existing Land Use Element would continue to provide outdated information that does not reflect the current conditions in the City. Despite these revisions to the General Plan Land Use Element, it is recognized that the City is 99 percent built out, thus, only a small portion of vacant land would be developed in the future. Therefore, land use designations under this Alternative would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan Update. Hence, implementation of this Alternative would not result in additional impacts related to compatibility with applicable plans, policies, or regulations, or loss of open space/vacant land. Land use impacts under this Alternative would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan Update. In this regard, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

Two objectives for the proposed General Plan Update are to update the City's environmental baseline conditions to 2001 and to update the General Plan development projections for the year 2020, which would include projections for dwelling units, non-residential square footage, population and employment. Given the two objectives stated in the previous sentence, the Existing General Plan Alternative does not reflect the most current population, employment and housing numbers or projections, nor does it provide quantitative population, housing and employment projections for future years. The population, housing and employment data in the Existing General Plan is based on the 1980 Census. Additionally, the Existing General Plan buildout planning horizon of the City was 10 to 20 years from 1988 (1998 to 2008). In contrast, the proposed General Plan Update reflects the current trend of the County

and the overall regional development. Furthermore, the proposed General Plan Update planning horizon extends to a specific horizon year of 2020.

Although the proposed General Plan Update contains updated population, employment and housing data, since the City is currently nearly 99 percent built out, impacts to population, employment and housing would be similar to those for the 1988 General Plan. Therefore, in regards to population, employment and housing impacts, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

AESTHETICS

Since the City is 99 percent built out, only a minimal amount of development would occur in the future under the Existing General Plan or the proposed General Plan Update. It is anticipated that the same areas would be developed under either the Existing General Plan or the proposed General Plan Update. Thus, the vacant sites would be developed under both of these scenarios at similar levels of intensity. The Existing General Plan includes goals and policies regarding the improvement of the visual character of the City. However, the proposed General Plan Update includes a new Community Design Element, which establishes updated and new goals and policies aimed at strengthening Cerritos' physical identity and high-quality image. Therefore, aesthetic impacts under this Alternative would be greater than those under the proposed General Plan Update. In this regard, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Under the Existing General Plan Alternative, the City would continue with an outdated traffic model, which does not reflect current conditions regarding regional growth or traffic. The proposed General Plan Update has updated the City's traffic model to reflect current and buildout conditions. However, the updated traffic model has identified significant and unavoidable impacts that were not identified in the 1988 General Plan. The proposed General Plan Update has identified significant and unavoidable impacts at buildout for two roadway segments: South Street, west of Studebaker Avenue (LOS E); and South Street, between I-605 and Grindley Avenue (LOS E). These roadway segments are currently operating at LOS C and LOS D, respectively. However, it is anticipated that similar significant and unavoidable impacts would occur under the Existing General Plan Alternative, due to growth in regional traffic. Thus, implementation of the Existing General Plan Alternative would neither improve nor worsen the level of service on these roadway segments. In this regard, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

AIR QUALITY

Given that the City is 99 percent built out, land use designations and associated vehicle trips and air contaminant emissions under the Existing General Plan Alternative would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan Update. Under the proposed General Plan Update, significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality would occur with regards to impacts related to construction, mobile sources and stationary sources. Given that anticipated increases in residential uses and non-residential uses would occur under both the Existing General Plan Alternative and the proposed General Plan Update, impacts associated with air quality are anticipated to be similar for either alternative. Thus, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

NOISE

Under the proposed General Plan Update, noise levels along numerous arterial streets would increase. Existing sensitive land uses, primarily residential areas, may be exposed to increased noise levels due to traffic increases. Specifically, the proposed General Plan Update identifies several roadway segments along Carmenita Avenue and Artesia Boulevard that may have significant noise impacts. However, noise impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would be reduced to less than significant with the imposition of goals, policies and mitigation measures. Given that anticipated increases in residential uses and non-residential uses would occur under both the Existing General Plan Alternative and the proposed General Plan Update, impacts associated with noise are anticipated to be similar for either alternative. Thus, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

GEOLOGIC AND SEISMIC HAZARDS

In comparison to the Existing General Plan Alternative, the proposed General Plan Update provides updated information regarding geologic and seismic hazards within the City. However, due to the nature of geologic conditions, and the time scale at which they are measured, this information is largely unchanged from the 1988 General Plan. As the City is 99 percent built out and no significant land use changes are included as part of the proposed General Plan Update, implementation of this Alternative would not result in additional impacts related to development in the areas of ground surface rupture due to faulting, seismic shaking, seismically-induced ground deformation, including liquefaction, landsliding and slope instability, erosion, or expansive soils, when compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, in regards to potential geologic and seismic impacts, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

HYDROLOGY AND DRAINAGE

The Conservation Element in the proposed General Plan Update provides updated information regarding the amount of groundwater utilized by the City of Cerritos. Implementation of the Existing General Plan Alternative would result in the omission of this data, and the continued use of outdated information, based on 1988 conditions. The General Plan Update proposes updated and new goals and policies regarding water resources and stormwater. Thus, omission of these clarifications, goals and policies could result in additional impacts related to hydrology and drainage when compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

However, grading and development of future projects, the addition of impervious surfaces (i.e., roadways, parking lots, and hardscape), and the introduction of landscaping irrigation associated with future development would occur under both the Existing General Plan Alternative and the proposed General Plan Update. Both alternatives would result in an increase in the population of the City that could be impacted by hydrology or drainage hazards. It is recognized that 99 percent of the City is built out; therefore, potential water quality degradation from surface runoff/erosion associated with forecasted growth under the Existing General Plan Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update. Furthermore, as no land use designation changes are included as part of the proposed General Plan Update, implementation of this Alternative would not result in additional impacts related to development in areas susceptible to flooding, when compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

It should be noted that certain activities presently occurring in the City that have the potential to degrade water quality would occur with this Alternative or with the proposed General Plan Update. These activities would be subject to continued compliance with legal/regulatory requirements (i.e., NPDES Permit Program).

In regards to potential hydrology and drainage impacts, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Given that the City is 99 percent built out and that land use designations were not modified in the proposed General Plan Update, land uses under the Existing General Plan Alternative would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan Update. Thus, implementation of the Existing General Plan Alternative would not result in additional impacts related to the demand for additional police, fire, parks and recreation, solid waste, storm drain, water supply, or wastewater facilities and services, when compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, as most of the schools in the City are currently at or above capacity, impacts to school facilities would be significant and unavoidable under both the Existing General Plan Alternative and the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, in regards to public services and utilities

impacts, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

PARKS AND RECREATION

The Open Space/Recreation Element in the proposed General Plan Update addresses parks and recreation facilities within the City, as does the Open Space and Recreation Element in the Existing General Plan. Information regarding these issues is largely unchanged, but has been updated in the proposed General Plan Update. Currently, the City of Cerritos has approximately 238 acres of parkland, including community, neighborhood and regional parks. The State of California standard for parks is 3 acres for every 1,000 residents. Currently, the City has a surplus of approximately 82 acres of parkland, and thus currently meets the State's standard. The City is approximately 99 percent built out, so there is minimal potential to acquire and develop additional parkland. The proposed General Plan Update projects an increase in population of 909 people to 53,009 by 2020. Based on the State parkland ratio of 3 acres per 1,000 people, the population increase of 909 residents would create a demand for approximately 3 acres of parkland. Given that the City currently has a surplus of 82 acres, the additional demand created by the proposed General Plan Update could be met with existing facilities. It is anticipated that growth under the Existing General Plan Alternative would result in similar impacts to parks and recreational facilities in the City as the proposed General Plan Update. Thus, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan in this regard.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would update information regarding public health and safety, thus, providing the citizens of Cerritos with increased public safety, as additional safety policies would be implemented beyond those in the existing 1988 General Plan. However, given that the City is 99 percent built out and that land use designations were not modified in the proposed General Plan Update, land uses under the Existing General Plan Alternative would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan Update. Thus, the vacant sites would be developed under both of these scenarios at the same level of intensity. Impacts associated with exposure to hazardous waste would be similar under this Alternative to those of the proposed General Plan Update. In this regard, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The potential degradation or loss of historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources would occur with this Alternative since development would occur on underutilized or vacant parcels of land. Given that the City is 99 percent built out and

the proposed General Plan Update does not include any modifications to land use designations, it is anticipated that the same the vacant or underutilized sites would be developed under both of these scenarios at similar intensity levels. Therefore, impacts to cultural resources under this Alternative would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan Update. In this regard, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

5.3.3 CONCLUSION

The Existing General Plan Alternative would result in similar environmental impacts as the proposed General Plan Update for land use, transportation/circulation, air quality, noise, geology and seismic hazards, hydrology/drainage, population/housing/employment, public services and utilities, parks and recreation, public health and safety and cultural resources. However, this Alternative would generate greater impacts than the proposed General Plan Update with respect to aesthetics. Implementation of the 1988 General Plan does not eliminate significant traffic and air quality, or school impacts.

However, as it is the intent of the proposed General Plan Update to provide new information based on current conditions within the City, the 1988 General Plan evaluated under the Existing General Plan Alternative would not serve the City as adequately as the proposed General Plan Update. Thus, the Existing General Plan Alternative is not considered environmentally superior when compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

5.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that an Environmentally Superior Alternative be identified; that is, an alternative that would result in the fewest or least significant environmental impacts.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would result in no change to the existing conditions within the City of Cerritos. Thus, the No Project/No Development Alternative could result in the eventual deterioration of existing conditions within the City of Cerritos. This could lead to the disrepair of existing buildings and infrastructure that could result in safety impacts. Therefore, no new or additional environmental impacts would result directly from this Alternative. The significant and unavoidable impacts for schools, traffic/circulation (determined by amount of regional traffic growth) and air quality, identified for the proposed General Plan Update would be avoided with this Alternative.

However, the No Project/No Development Alternative is rejected as the environmentally superior alternative for the following reasons. First, this Alternative would prevent the City of Cerritos from adequately mitigating potentially significant impacts or making needed improvements to existing properties, infrastructure, and public services.

Existing conditions, under this Alternative would be maintained, but not improved. Second, the No Project/No Development Alternative fails to accomplish the project objectives. And third, it is the intent and objective of the proposed General Plan Update to provide new information based on current conditions in the City. Thus, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not serve the City as adequately as the proposed General Plan Update.

As it is the intent of the proposed General Plan Update to provide new information based on current conditions within the City, the 1988 General Plan evaluated under the Existing General Plan Alternative would not serve the City as adequately as the proposed General Plan Update. Overall, the Existing General Plan Alternative and the proposed General Plan Update would result in similar environmental impacts; thus it is not necessary to select the Existing General Plan Alternative to reduce significant environmental effects. With respect to meeting the stated objectives of the General Plan Update and EIR, the proposed General Plan Update includes goals and policies to ensure long-term development throughout the City.

Based on the analysis of each of the alternatives, the proposed General Plan Update is the environmentally superior alternative.