

6 ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

6.1 RATIONALE FOR ALTERNATIVES SELECTION

CEQA requires the consideration of alternatives to the proposed Amendment and the analysis of impacts associated with those alternatives. By comparing the proposed Amendment to the alternatives, the advantages of each can be weighed and analyzed. Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”

Additionally, the CEQA Guidelines state the following:

- The specific alternative of “no project” shall also be evaluated along with its impact. If the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. [Section 15126.6(e)(1)(2)]
- An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly discuss the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. [Section 15126.6(a)(c)]
- “Feasible” means capable of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors. [Section 15364]

CEQA requires identification of alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the proposed Amendment. Based on the analysis in Chapter 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis Approach*, of this SEIR, the proposed Amendment would result in significant impacts for air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG), noise and vibration, and transportation. The range of alternatives analyzed in detail in the SEIR includes two alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 3) that were evaluated in the approved Plan PEIR in addition to a No Project Alternative (the approved Plan [Alternative 1]) and two additional alternatives (Alternatives 4 and 5) developed as part of the proposed Amendment. The remaining parts of this chapter provide the following:

- A description of alternatives considered in detail.
- A summary of the environmental impacts of each alternative and a comparison of each alternative’s impacts to those of the proposed Amendment. The focus of this analysis is to determine if alternatives are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening the significant environmental effects of the proposed Amendment to a less- than-significant level.
- A discussion of the environmentally superior alternative.
- A discussion of alternatives considered but rejected from detailed analysis.

6.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL

Aside from Alternative 1: No Project (the approved Plan), the alternatives analyzed in detail are considered potentially feasible for the purposes of a CEQA analysis of alternatives to the proposed Amendment, although some of elements of the alternatives may require major changes in legislation or policy, or in the availability of funding. The alternatives are described below. The primary focus of the alternatives descriptions is on the characteristics that differentiate them from the proposed Amendment.

Appendix E (*Alternatives Data*, an update of Appendix O in the approved Plan PEIR) provides the following information to support the analysis of the alternatives:

- Table E-1: Performance Measures for Alternatives Considered in Detail in this SEIR (including population, housing, and employment information)
- Table E-2: SB 375 GHG Reductions for Alternatives Considered in Detail in this SEIR
- Table E-3: EMFAC 2017 Onroad Output Summary for Alternatives Considered in Detail in this SEIR

6.2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT (THE APPROVED PLAN)

CEQA requires a No Project Alternative to be analyzed in the EIR. The No Project Alternative assumes that all of the plans and policies included in the approved Plan would be implemented, including the regional road usage charge, and is further described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, of the approved Plan PEIR.

6.2.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: 2019 TRANSPORTATION NETWORK WITH NEW VALUE PRICING AND USER FEE POLICIES

Alternative 2 is the same as described in Chapter 6, *Alternatives Analysis*, of the approved Plan PEIR.

6.2.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: ALL GROWTH IN MOBILITY HUBS AND MORE PROGRESSIVE VALUE PRICING AND USER FEE POLICIES

Alternative 3 is the same as described in Chapter 6 of the approved Plan PEIR.

6.2.4 ALTERNATIVE 4: PROGRESSIVE PRICING AND NO REGIONAL ROAD USAGE CHARGE

Alternative 4 consists of the approved Plan transportation network and land use pattern included in the SCS, with more progressive toll pricing and parking costs than what is included in the approved Plan or Alternative 3. Alternative 4 does not include the regional road usage charge. Funding for Alternative 4 would be the same as described for the approved Plan.

6.2.5 ALTERNATIVE 5: ALL GROWTH IN MOBILITY HUBS, PROGRESSIVE PRICING, AND NO REGIONAL ROAD USAGE CHARGE

Alternative 5 consists of the approved Plan transportation network, a land use pattern focusing all regional growth in mobility hubs (as in Alternative 3), with more progressive toll pricing and parking costs than what is included in the approved Plan or Alternative 3 (as in Alternative 4). Alternative 5 does not include a regional road usage charge. Funding for Alternative 5 would be the same as described for the approved Plan.

Table 6-1 provides a comparison of the components of each of the alternatives considered in detail.

**Table 6-1
Summary of Alternatives Considered in Detail**

Components		Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 4: Progressive Pricing and No Regional Road Usage Charge	Alternative 5: All Growth in Mobility Hubs, Progressive Pricing, and No Regional Road Usage Charge
<i>Land Use Pattern</i>		Approved Plan, SCS land use pattern	2019 Federal Regional Transportation Plan (2019 Federal RTP) land use pattern	Land use pattern focusing all regional growth in mobility hubs	Approved Plan, SCS land use pattern	Land use pattern focusing all regional growth in mobility hubs
<i>Transportation Network</i>		Approved Plan transportation network	2019 Federal RTP transportation network	Approved Plan transportation network	Approved Plan transportation network	Approved Plan transportation network
<i>Value Pricing and User Fees Policies</i>	<i>Toll Pricing</i>	Approved Plan	Approved Plan	Approved Plan	Increase toll pricing by 100% for all horizon years	Increase toll pricing by 100% for all horizon years
	<i>Regional Road User Charge</i>	Approved Plan	None	Increase regional road usage charge by 50% compared to the approved Plan	None	None
	<i>Parking Costs</i>	Approved Plan	2019 Federal RTP	Increase parking costs by 50% compared to the approved Plan	Increase parking costs by 100% compared to approved Plan	Increase parking costs by 100% compared to approved Plan
	<i>Transit Costs</i>	Approved Plan	2019 Federal RTP (No planned transit fare discounts)	Free transit by 2035	Free transit by 2035	Free transit by 2035
	<i>Microtransit Costs</i>	Approved Plan	N/A	Free Microtransit by 2035	Free Microtransit by 2035	Free Microtransit by 2035
	<i>Micro-Transponder Ownership</i>	Approved Plan	Approved Plan	Approved Plan	Approved Plan	Approved Plan

Components		Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 4: Progressive Pricing and No Regional Road Usage Charge	Alternative 5: All Growth in Mobility Hubs, Progressive Pricing, and No Regional Road Usage Charge
	<i>Telework Assumptions</i>	Approved Plan	Approved Plan	Approved Plan	Approved Plan	Approved Plan
	<i>Micromobility</i>	Approved Plan	Approved Plan	Approved Plan	Approved Plan	Approved Plan
<i>Funding</i>		Approved Plan	2019 Federal RTP (\$130 billion)	Approved Plan	Approved Plan	Approved Plan

Note: The SEIR includes updated results from the approved Plan PEIR for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 with the model corrections described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, of this SEIR.

6.2.6 BASIC PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Alternatives were developed as alternate means of achieving most of the basic project objectives for the approved Plan PEIR. Those objectives are found in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, of the approved Plan PEIR and set forth in Table 6-2 below.

The proposed Amendment has the additional objective of removing the regional road usage charge while continuing to meet State and federal planning requirements, regional GHG reduction targets, and federal air quality conformity standards.

Table 6-2 shows that all the action alternatives considered in detail in this SEIR partially or fully meet most of the basic project objectives. In this table, a “yes” indicates that an alternative can at least partially, if not fully, meet project objectives.

This page left intentionally blank.

**Table 6-2
Ability of Alternatives Considered in Detail in this SEIR to Meet Basic Project Objectives**

Project Objectives	Proposed Amendment	Alternatives Considered in Detail in this SEIR				
		Alternative 1: No Project (the approved Plan)	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 4: Progressive Pricing and No Regional Road Usage Charge	Alternative 5: All Growth in Mobility Hubs, Progressive Pricing, and No Regional Road Usage Charge
1. Focus population and employment growth in mobility hubs and existing urban areas to protect sensitive habitat and natural resource areas.	Yes.	Yes, alternative includes mobility hubs.	No, alternative does not include mobility hubs.	Yes, alternative focuses all new growth in mobility hubs.	Yes, alternative includes the same mobility hubs.	Yes, alternative focuses all new growth in mobility hubs.
2. Provide transportation investments that support compact land development patterns and reduce sprawl.	Yes.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments that would reduce sprawl.	Yes, alternative includes incentivizing investments in smart growth areas.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments that would reduce sprawl.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments that would reduce sprawl.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments that would reduce sprawl.
3. Meet GHG emissions targets established for the San Diego region by the California Air Resources Board and the SANDAG Board of Directors.	Yes.	Yes, see Appendix E, Table E-2 for SB 375 target achievement.	No, see Appendix E, Table E-2.	Yes, see Appendix E, Table E-2 for SB 375 target achievement.	Yes, see Appendix E, Table E-2 for SB 375 target achievement.	Yes, see Appendix E, Table E-2 for SB 375 target achievement.
4. Provide transportation investments and land use patterns that promote social equity.	Yes.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and land use patterns that would promote social equity.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and land use patterns that would promote social equity.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and land use patterns that would promote social equity; the land use pattern for this alternative focuses growth in mobility hubs to maximize transit access to employment, educational, and recreational opportunities throughout the region.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and land use patterns that would promote social equity.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and land use patterns that would promote social equity; the land use pattern for this alternative focuses growth in mobility hubs to maximize transit access to employment, educational, and recreational opportunities throughout the region.
5. Provide transportation investments and land use patterns that reduce VMT and improve air quality.	Yes.	Yes, based on the modeling results identified in Appendix E, Tables E-1 and E-2, this alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would reduce VMT and improve air quality.	Yes, based on the modeling results identified in Appendix E, Tables E-1 and E-2, this alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would reduce VMT and improve air quality.	Yes, based on the modeling results identified in Appendix E, Tables E-1 and E-2, this alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would reduce VMT and improve air quality.	Yes, based on the modeling results identified in Appendix E, Tables E-1 and E-2, this alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would reduce VMT and improve air quality.	Yes, based on the modeling results identified in Appendix E, Tables E-1 and E-2, this alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would reduce VMT and improve air quality.
6. Provide multi-modal access to employment centers and key destinations for all communities.	Yes.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would provide multi-modal access to employment centers and key destinations.	Yes, alternative includes transportation improvements and land use pattern that would encourage growth within smart growth areas.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would provide multi-modal access to employment centers and key destinations.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would provide multi-modal access to employment centers and key destinations.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would provide multi-modal access to employment centers and key destinations.
7. Enhance the efficiency of the transportation network for moving people and goods through the deployment of new technologies.	Yes.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would move people and goods with new technologies.	Yes, the transportation network for this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would move people and goods with new technologies.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would move people and goods with new technologies.	Yes, alternative includes transportation investments and a land use pattern that would move people and goods with new technologies.
<i>Proposed Amendment Objective.</i> To amend the approved Plan by removing the regional road usage charge while continuing to meet State and federal planning requirements, regional GHG reduction targets, and federal air quality conformity standards.	Yes.	No, this alternative includes the regional road usage charge.	No, this alternative does not meet the region's GHG reduction target.	No, this alternative includes the regional road usage charge.	Yes.	Yes.

This page left intentionally blank.

6.3 ALTERNATIVES COMPARISON

Table 6-3 (at the end of this chapter) provides a list of impacts and their significance for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 with a comparison of the impacts of each alternative to those of the proposed Amendment. Calculations for the alternatives analysis are provided in Appendix E of this SEIR.

6.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Based on the analysis of alternatives provided in Table 6-3, Alternative 5 is the environmentally superior alternative. Compared to the proposed Amendment's significant impacts, Alternative 5 would have decreased impacts for one or more significance criteria for the following environmental resources: air quality, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, noise and vibration, and transportation.

Alternative 5 would result in a 23.5 percent per capita GHG reduction in 2050, which is a greater reduction than the proposed Amendment (19.7 percent below 2005 in 2050) (see Appendix E, Table E-2). In addition, Alternative 5 would result in slightly lower VMT per capita (23.3) (home-based) compared to the proposed Amendment VMT per capita (24.3) in 2050 (see Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 5 would result in a total VMT increase of 3,298,516 miles per day in 2050 compared to 2025, which is approximately 33 percent lower than the proposed Amendment (total VMT increase of 4,907,031 miles per day in 2050). Alternative 5 would also result in a decrease in reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrous oxides (NO_x) carbon monoxide (CO), and fine and respirable particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀), and sulfur oxide (SO_x) emissions compared to the proposed Amendment from on-road sources (see Appendix E, Table E-3).

Among the alternatives, Alternative 5 would achieve the greatest reductions of VMT, GHG emissions, and air quality emissions as compared to the proposed Amendment.

6.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

Several alternatives that were either considered by SANDAG decisionmakers, raised by the public during the planning process for the approved Plan, or raised in public comments on the NOP for the approved Plan PEIR were rejected from detailed consideration. For further information on the alternatives considered but rejected for the approved Plan, see Section 6.5 of the approved Plan PEIR.

Public comments on the NOP for the proposed Amendment raised one alternative for consideration. This alternative was considered but rejected and is summarized below.

6.5.1 LA PLAYA PLAN

In a January 8, 2023, NOP comment letter, Katheryn Rhodes requested that the proposed Amendment include analysis of an alternative La Playa Plan (LPP) for a Full Tidelands Reclamation project. The letter presents the LPP alternative as an effective alternative to the proposed Amendment because it would significantly reduce GHG emissions impacts in the SANDAG region. The LPP alternative suggests several projects already included in the proposed Amendment (a central mobility hub, enhanced active transportation corridors, and improved fleet connectivity to San Diego International Airport [SDIA] facilities). Funding for the LPP would be subject to confirmation that SDIA is a Grandfathered Airport, which would allow normally restricted Federal Aviation Administration Airport revenue to be diverted towards airport transportation projects, including the proposed annexation of port tidelands.

Reasons for Rejection

The LPP alternative focuses on a limited geographical portion of the region. In addition, most of the major elements of the LPP alternative are already included in the proposed Amendment and/or Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 analyzed in this SEIR, such as a central mobility hub, enhanced active transportation corridors, and improved fleet connectivity to SDIA facilities.

The LPP alternative is an individual project in a limited geographical portion of the region rather than an alternative for the proposed Amendment as a whole, and CEQA does not require analysis of alternatives to individual components of a project (see *California Oak Foundation v. Regents of University of California* (2010) 188 Cal. App. 4th 227, 276–277). Because it is limited, this alternative would not avoid or substantially reduce any of the proposed Amendment’s significant impacts. For these reasons, this alternative has been rejected from further consideration.

**Table 6-3
Comparison of Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 to the Proposed Amendment**

This table provides a list of impacts and their significance for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 with a comparison of the impacts of each alternative to those of the proposed Amendment. Calculations for the alternatives analysis are provided in Appendix E of this SEIR. The designation “significant impact” in Table 6-3 refers to the level of significance of the impact identified for the proposed Amendment as analyzed in this SEIR. The thresholds of significance for each resource area are included in the respective resource sections in Chapter 4. Within the parentheses is the comparison of the alternative impact to the significance of the impact identified for the proposed Amendment (i.e., same, increased, decreased). The level of significance may be the same for the proposed Amendment and an alternative for a given threshold, but the impacts from an alternative may be increased or decreased to a degree without changing the significance determination.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project (the approved Plan)	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 4: Progressive Pricing and No Regional Road Usage Charge	Alternative 5: All Growth in Mobility Hubs, Progressive Pricing, and No Regional Road Usage Charge
Air Quality					
2025	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would also be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would also be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would also be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would also be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would also be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-2. Alternative 1 would have the same emissions levels for 2025 as the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Therefore, because the proposed Amendment would result in a less-than-significant impact and Alternative 1 would maintain similar levels of emissions, impacts would still be less than significant.	Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-2. Alternative 2 would cause an increase in emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). The proposed Amendment would result in less than significant impact, and while Alternative 2 would result in increased emissions compared to the proposed Amendment, impacts would still be less than significant.	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-2. Alternative 3 would have lower emissions compared to the proposed (Appendix E, Table E-3). Therefore, because the proposed Amendment would result in a less-than-significant impact and Alternative 3 would lower emissions, impacts would still be less than significant.	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-2. Alternative 4 would have lower emissions compared to the proposed (Appendix E, Table E-3). Therefore, because the proposed Amendment would result in a less-than-significant impact and Alternative 4 would lower emissions, impacts would still be less than significant.	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-2. Alternative 5 would have lower emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Therefore, because the proposed Amendment would result in a less-than-significant impact and Alternative 5 would lower emissions, impacts would still be less than significant.
	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for AQ-4. Alternative 1 would result in similar PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment and would result in a similar significant impact (Appendix E, Table E-3).	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for AQ-4. Alternative 2 would result in higher PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Alternative 2 would have higher PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment and would also result in an increased significant impact.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for AQ-4. Alternative 3 would result in a small decrease of PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Alternative 3 would have slightly lower PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for AQ-4. Alternative 4 would result in a small decrease of PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Alternative 4 would have slightly lower PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for AQ-4. Alternative 5 would result in the greatest decrease of PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment and other alternatives (Appendix E, Table E-3). Alternative 5 would have lower PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for AQ-5. As discussed in Section 4.1, individual receptors exposed to substantial TAC concentrations would differ compared to the proposed Amendment. Alternative 1 would have the same regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements as the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-1). However, Alternative 1 would result in greater VMT reduction per capita, thereby decreasing TACs from roadways. Overall, diesel exposure would be	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for AQ-5. Alternative 2 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Amendment but would not result in focused growth in Mobility Hubs and would not include the diesel commuter rail lines. However, Alternative 2 would result in higher per capita and overall VMT, which could increase TACs from roadways. Diesel exposure would also increase under Alternative 2 compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Overall,	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for AQ-5. Alternative 3 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Amendment, but would focus all growth in the Mobility Hubs. The increase in population in the Mobility Hubs may increase the amount of people exposed to this increased cancer risk compared to the proposed Amendment. Alternative 3 would result in slightly lower per capita and overall VMT, which could slightly decrease TACs from roadways. Diesel exposure would also slightly decrease under	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for AQ-5. Alternative 4 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Amendment. Alternative 4 would result in lower per capita and overall VMT, which could decrease TACs from roadways. While diesel exposure would slightly increase under Alternative 4 compared to the proposed Amendment, this would be offset by a decrease in roadway TACs due to decrease in VMT (Appendix E, Table E-3). Alternative 4 would have lower TACs compared to the	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2025 for AQ-5. Alternative 5 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Amendment but would focus all growth in the Mobility Hubs. The increase in population in the Mobility Hubs may increase the amount of people exposed to this increased cancer risk compared to the proposed Amendment. Alternative 5 would result in lower per capita and overall VMT, which could decrease TACs from roadways. Diesel exposure would slightly decrease under

Year	Alternative 1: No Project (the approved Plan)	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 4: Progressive Pricing and No Regional Road Usage Charge	Alternative 5: All Growth in Mobility Hubs, Progressive Pricing, and No Regional Road Usage Charge
	similar under Alternative 1 as the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Due to the decrease in roadway TACs from decreased on-road VMT, Alternative 1 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.	while diesel exposure due to commuter rail lines would decrease, this would be offset by an increase in roadways TACs due to increased on-road fuel consumption (Appendix E, Table E-3). Alternative 2 would have higher TACs compared to the proposed Amendment and would result in a significant impact.	Alternative 3 compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). While Alternative 3 would have slightly lower TACs compared to the proposed Amendment, it would have the potential for more people to be exposed in Mobility Hubs and would therefore result in a similar significant impact.	proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.	Alternative 5 compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Alternative 5 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Amendment but would have the potential for more people to be exposed in Mobility Hubs and would therefore result in a similar significant impact.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-6. Alternative 1 would result in similar winter CO emissions to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). These CO emissions would be substantially less than the baseline (2016) conditions. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease under Alternative 1 as under the proposed Amendment and be substantially below the baseline (2016) conditions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-6. Alternative 2 would result in higher winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). However, these CO emissions would be substantially less than the baseline (2016) conditions. Exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would increase under Alternative 2 compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a less-than-significant impact.	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-6. Alternative 3 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease under Alternative 3 as under the proposed Amendment and be substantially below the baseline (2016) conditions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-6. Alternative 4 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease under Alternative 4 as under the proposed Amendment and be substantially below the baseline (2016) conditions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for AQ-6. Alternative 5 would result in the lowest winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment and the other alternatives (Appendix E, Table E-3). Exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease the most under Alternative 5 compared to the proposed Amendment and the other alternatives and would be substantially below the baseline (2016) conditions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.
2035	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-2. Alternative 1 would have lower VMT and slightly lower on-road emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Therefore, because the proposed Amendment would result in a less-than-significant impact and Alternative 1 would result in lower emissions than the proposed Amendment, impacts would still be less than significant.	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for AQ-2. Alternative 2 would cause an increase in on-road emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in increased emissions compared to the proposed Amendment, and impacts would be potentially significant.	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-2. Alternative 3 would have lower VMT and emissions from on-road sources compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Therefore, because the proposed Amendment would result in a less-than-significant impact and Alternative 3 would result in lower emissions than the proposed Amendment, impacts would still be less than significant.	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-2. Alternative 4 would have lower VMT and emissions from on-road sources compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Therefore, because the proposed Amendment would result in a less-than-significant impact and Alternative 4 would result in lower emissions than the proposed Amendment, impacts would still be less than significant.	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-2. Alternative 5 would have lower VMT and emissions from on-road sources compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Therefore, because the proposed Amendment would result in a less-than-significant impact and Alternative 5 would result in lower emissions than the proposed Amendment, impacts would still be less than significant.
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for AQ-4. Alternative 1 would result in lower PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Additionally, as discussed in Section 4.1, areas exposed to exceedances of the annual PM10 CAAQS would differ compared to the proposed Amendment. Thus, Alternative 1 would have lower PM10 concentration	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for AQ-4. Alternative 2 would result in higher PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus, Alternative 2 would have higher PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment and would still result in a significant impact.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for AQ-4. Alternative 3 would result in lower PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus, Alternative 3 would have lower PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for AQ-4. Alternative 4 would result in a decrease of PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus, Alternative 4 would have lower PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for AQ-4. Alternative 5 would result in a decrease of PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus, Alternative 5 would have lower PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project (the approved Plan)	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 4: Progressive Pricing and No Regional Road Usage Charge	Alternative 5: All Growth in Mobility Hubs, Progressive Pricing, and No Regional Road Usage Charge
	<p>impacts compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.</p> <p>Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for AQ-5, exposing sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. As discussed in Section 4.1, individual receptors exposed to substantial TAC concentrations would differ compared to the proposed Amendment. Alternative 1 would have the same regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements as the proposed Amendment. Alternative 1 would result in lower per capita and overall VMT than the proposed Amendment, which would decrease TACs from roadways. However, diesel exposure would slightly increase compared to the proposed Amendment, thus increasing TACs. Overall, Alternative 1 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.</p>	<p>Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for AQ-5, exposing sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 2 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Amendment but would not result in focused growth in Mobility Hubs and would not include the diesel commuter rail lines. However, Alternative 2 would result in higher per capita and overall VMT, which could increase TACs from roadways. Diesel exposure would also increase under Alternative 2 compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Overall, Alternative 2 would have higher TACs compared to the proposed Amendment and would still result in a significant impact.</p>	<p>Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for AQ-5, exposing sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 3 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Amendment but would focus all growth in the Mobility Hubs. The increase in population in the Mobility Hubs may increase the amount of people exposed to this increased cancer risk compared to the proposed Amendment. Moreover, Alternative 3 would result in lower per capita and overall VMT compared to the proposed Amendment, which could decrease TACs from roadways. Diesel exposure would also slightly decrease under Alternative 3 compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Alternative 3 would have slightly lower TACs compared to the proposed Amendment but would have the potential for more people to be exposed in Mobility Hubs and would therefore result in a similar significant impact.</p>	<p>Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for AQ-5, exposing sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 4 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Amendment but would result in lower per capita and overall VMT compared to the proposed Amendment, as well as lower on-road emissions, including lower annual diesel emissions (Appendix E, Table E-3). Therefore, Alternative 4 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.</p>	<p>Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for AQ-5, exposing sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 5 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Amendment but would focus all growth in the Mobility Hubs. The increase in population in the Mobility Hubs may increase the amount of people exposed to this increased cancer risk compared to the proposed Amendment. The proposed would result in lower per capita and overall VMT compared to the proposed Amendment, as well as lower on-road emissions, including lower annual diesel emissions. Diesel exposure would also decrease under Alternative 5 compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Alternative 5 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Amendment but would have the potential for more people to be exposed in Mobility Hubs and would therefore result in a similar significant impact.</p>
	<p>Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-6. Alternative 1 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease under Alternative 1 as under the proposed Amendment and be substantially below the baseline (2016) conditions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-6. Alternative 2 would result in higher winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). However, these CO emissions would be substantially less than the baseline (2016) conditions. Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would increase under Alternative 2 as under the proposed Amendment but still result in a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-6. Alternative 3 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease under Alternative 3 as under the proposed Amendment and be substantially below the baseline (2016) conditions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-6. Alternative 4 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease under Alternative 4 as under the proposed Amendment and be substantially below the baseline (2016) conditions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for AQ-6. Alternative 5 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO concentrations would decrease under Alternative 5 as under the proposed Amendment and be substantially below the baseline (2016) conditions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>
2050	<p>Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.</p>	<p>Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.</p>	<p>Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.</p>	<p>Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.</p>	<p>Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for AQ-1. As with the proposed Amendment, this alternative would be consistent with the 2022 RAQS and the 2020 SIP.</p>
	<p>Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-2. Alternative 1 would have lower VMT and emissions from on-road sources (with the</p>	<p>Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-2. Alternative 2 would result in higher emissions from on-road sources compared to</p>	<p>Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-2. Alternative 3 would have lower VMT and emissions from on-road sources, but</p>	<p>Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-2. Alternative 4 would have lower VMT and emissions from on-road sources</p>	<p>Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-2. Alternative 5 would have lower VMT and emissions from on-road</p>

Year	Alternative 1: No Project (the approved Plan)	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 4: Progressive Pricing and No Regional Road Usage Charge	Alternative 5: All Growth in Mobility Hubs, Progressive Pricing, and No Regional Road Usage Charge
	exception of a 1.02-thousand-gallons-per-day increase in annual diesel in 2050) and would result in less on-road emissions than the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). The proposed Amendment would result in a significant impact for AQ-2, and while Alternative 1 would result in slightly lower on-road emissions when compared to the proposed Amendment, impacts would still be significant.	the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Therefore, because the proposed Amendment would result in a significant impact and Alternative 2 would result in increased emissions when compared to the proposed Amendment, impacts would still be significant.	similar emissions from commuter rail compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). The proposed Amendment would result in a significant impact for AQ-2, and while Alternative 3 would lower on-road emissions compared to the proposed Amendment, impacts would still be significant.	compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). The proposed Amendment would result in a significant impact for AQ-2, and while Alternative 4 would result in decreased emissions compared to the proposed Amendment, impacts would still be significant.	sources, but similar emissions from commuter rail compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). The proposed Amendment would result in a significant impact for AQ-2, and while Alternative 5 would result in decreased emissions compared to the proposed Amendment, impacts would still be significant.
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-4. Alternative 1 would result in lower PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Additionally, as discussed in Section 4.1, areas exposed to exceedances of the annual PM10 CAAQS would differ compared to the proposed Amendment. Thus, Alternative 1 would have lower PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-4. Alternative 2 would result in higher PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus, Alternative 2 would have higher PM10 concentrations compared to the proposed Amendment and would still result in a significant impact.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-4. Alternative 3 would result in lower PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus, Alternative 3 would have lower PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-4. Alternative 4 would result in lower PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus Alternative 4 would have lower PM10 concentration compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a similar significant impact.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-4. Alternative 5 would result in a lower PM10 and PM2.5 emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus, Alternative 5 would have lower PM10 concentration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a similar significant impact.
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-5 and would expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. As discussed in Section 4.1, individual receptors exposed to substantial TAC concentrations would differ compared to the proposed Amendment. Alternative 1 would have the same regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements as the proposed Amendment. Alternative 1 would result in lower per capita and overall VMT than the proposed Amendment, which would decrease TACs from roadways. However, annual diesel exposure would slightly increase compared to the proposed Amendment, thus increasing TACs. Overall, Alternative 1 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a significant impact.	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-5 and would expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 2 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Amendment but would not result in focused growth in Mobility Hubs and would not include the diesel commuter rail lines. However, Alternative 2 would result in higher per capita and overall VMT, which could increase TACs from roadways. Diesel exposure would also increase under Alternative 2 compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Overall, Alternative 2 would have higher TACs compared to the proposed Amendment and would result in a significant impact.	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-5 and would expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 3 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Amendment, but would focus all growth in the Mobility Hubs. The increase in population in the Mobility Hubs may increase the amount of people exposed to this increased cancer risk compared to the proposed Amendment. Moreover, Alternative 3 would result in lower per capita and overall VMT compared to the proposed Amendment, which could decrease TACs from roadways. Diesel exposure would slightly increase under Alternative 3 compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Overall, Alternative 3 would have similar TACs compared to the proposed Amendment and would result in a similar significant impact.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-5 and would expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 4 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Amendment but would result in lower per capita and overall VMT compared to the proposed Amendment, as well as lower on-road emissions, including lower annual diesel emissions. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Amendment but would still result in a similar significant impact.	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2050 for AQ-5 and would expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. Alternative 5 would result in similar population growth as the proposed Amendment but would focus all growth in Mobility Hubs. The increase in population in the Mobility Hubs may increase the amount of people exposed to this increased cancer risk compared to the proposed Amendment. Moreover, Alternative 5 would result in lower per capita and overall VMT compared to the proposed Amendment, as well as lower on-road emissions, including lower annual diesel emissions. Alternative 5 would have lower TACs compared to the proposed Amendment but would have the potential for more people to be exposed in Mobility Hubs and would therefore result in a similar significant impact.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for AQ-6. Alternative 1 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus,	Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for AQ-6. Alternative 2 would result in higher winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for AQ-6. Alternative 3 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus,	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for AQ-6. Alternative 4 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus,	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for AQ-6. Alternative 5 would result in lower winter CO emissions compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-3). Thus,

Year	Alternative 1: No Project (the approved Plan)	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 4: Progressive Pricing and No Regional Road Usage Charge	Alternative 5: All Growth in Mobility Hubs, Progressive Pricing, and No Regional Road Usage Charge
	Thus, Alternative 1 would have similar impacts as the proposed Amendment.	Alternative 2 would result in increased impacts.	proposed Amendment. Thus, Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts.	Thus, Alternative 4 would have similar impacts as the proposed Amendment.	proposed Amendment. Thus Alternative 5 would result in decreased impacts.
	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (EN-2). Alternative 1 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed Amendment.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (EN-2). Alternative 2 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed Amendment.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (EN-2). Alternative 3 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed Amendment.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (EN-2). Alternative 4 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed Amendment.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 (EN-2). Alternative 5 would be consistent with adopted plans to address energy; thus, it would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed Amendment.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions					
2025	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (GHG-1 and GHG-4). Alternative 1 would have the same regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements as the proposed Amendment and would result in similar GHG emissions and similar impacts (Appendix E, Table E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (GHG-1 and GHG-4). Alternative 2 would result in higher GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment due to a less compact land use pattern and fewer transit-oriented transportation network improvements and would result in increased impacts (Appendix E, Table E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (GHG-1 and GHG-4). Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment due to more compact development and more progressive value pricing and user fee policies, and would result in decreased impacts (Appendix E, Table E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (GHG-1 and GHG-4). Alternative 4 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment due to more progressive pricing policies and would result in decreased impacts (Appendix E, Table E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2025 (GHG-1 and GHG-4). Alternative 5 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment due to more compact development and more progressive pricing policies and would result in decreased impacts (Appendix E, Table E-3).
	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2030 (GHG-5). Alternative 1 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Amendment but would not meet the reduction target reference point for 2030 and would result in similar impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2030 (GHG-5). Alternative 2 would result in higher GHG emissions that would not meet the reduction target reference point for 2030 and would result in increased impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2030 (GHG-5). Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Amendment but would not meet the reduction target reference point for 2030 and would result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2030 (GHG-5). Alternative 4 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Amendment but would not meet the reduction target reference point for 2030 and would result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2030 (GHG-5). Alternative 5 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Amendment but would not meet the reduction target reference point for 2030 and would result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).
2035	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (GHG-1, GHG-3, and GHG-4). Alternative 1 would have the same regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements as the proposed Amendment; however, Alternative 1 would result in lower GHG emissions due to the inclusion of the regional road usage charge and would result in decreased impacts (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (GHG-1, GHG-3, and GHG-4). Alternative 2 would result in higher GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment due to a less compact land use pattern and fewer transit-oriented transportation network improvements. However, Alternative 2 emissions in 2035 would still be below existing levels (GHG-1), would achieve at least a 30% reduction per capita relative to existing levels (GHG-3), and would not conflict with or impede the implementation of local plans (GHG-4) (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (GHG-1, GHG-3, and GHG-4). Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment due to more compact development around mobility hubs and more progressive value pricing and user fee policies, and would result in decreased impacts (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (GHG-1, GHG-3, and GHG-4). Alternative 4 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment due to more progressive pricing policies and would result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2035 (GHG-1, GHG-3, and GHG-4). Alternative 5 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment due to more compact development and more progressive pricing policies and would result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).
	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for GHG-2 and would result in a decreased impact compared to the proposed Amendment. Alternative 1 would result in a 20.0% per capita GHG reduction, which would exceed the 2035	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 for GHG-2 and would result in an increased impact compared to the proposed Amendment. Alternative 2 would result in a 11.8% per capita GHG reduction, which would not meet the 2035 reduction goal of 19%	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for GHG-2 and would result in a decreased impact compared to the proposed Amendment. Alternative 3 would result in a 22.7% per capita GHG reduction, which would exceed the 2035	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for GHG-2 and would result in a decreased impact compared to the proposed Amendment. Alternative 4 would result in a 22.1% per capita GHG reduction, which would exceed the 2035	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for GHG-2 and would result in a decreased impact compared to the proposed Amendment. Alternative 5 would result in a 22.0% per capita GHG reduction, which would exceed the 2035

Year	Alternative 1: No Project (the approved Plan)	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 4: Progressive Pricing and No Regional Road Usage Charge	Alternative 5: All Growth in Mobility Hubs, Progressive Pricing, and No Regional Road Usage Charge
	reduction goal of 19% below 2005 levels and would result in a greater reduction than the proposed Amendment (19.0% below 2005) (Appendix E, Table E-2).	below 2005 levels and would result in less reductions than the proposed Amendment (19.0% below 2005) (Appendix E, Table E-2).	reduction goal of 19% below 2005 levels and would result in a greater reduction than the proposed Amendment (19.0% below 2005) (Appendix E, Table E-2).	reduction goal of 19% below 2005 levels and would result in a greater reduction than the proposed Amendment (19.0% below 2005) (Appendix E, Table E-2).	reduction goal of 19% below 2005 levels and would result in a greater reduction than the proposed Amendment (19.0% below 2005) (Appendix E, Table E-2).
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (GHG-5). Alternative 1 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Amendment due to the inclusion of the regional road usage charge but would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2030 and 2045 and would therefore result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (GHG-5). Alternative 2 would result in higher GHG emissions that would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2030 and 2045 and would therefore result in increased impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (GHG-5). Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Amendment but would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2030 and 2045 and would therefore result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (GHG-5). Alternative 4 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Amendment but would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2030 and 2045 and would therefore result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (GHG-5). Alternative 5 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Amendment but would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2030 and 2045 and would therefore result in decreased impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).
2050	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (GHG-1 and GHG-4). Alternative 1 would have the same regional growth, land uses, and transportation network improvements as the proposed Amendment, but the inclusion of the regional road usage charge would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment and would result in decreased impacts (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (GHG-1 and GHG-4). Alternative 2 would result in higher GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment and would result in increased impacts (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (GHG-1 and GHG-4). Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment due to more compact development, and would result in decreased impacts (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (GHG-1 and GHG-4). Alternative 4 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment due to more progressive pricing and would result in decreased impacts (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Less-than-Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in less-than-significant impacts in 2050 (GHG-1 and GHG-4). Alternative 5 would result in lower GHG emissions than the proposed Amendment and would result in decreased impacts (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (GHG-5). Alternative 1 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Amendment, but still would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2045 and 2050 (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (GHG-5). Alternative 2 would result in higher GHG emissions that would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2045 and 2050 and would result in increased impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (GHG-5). Alternative 3 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Amendment, but still would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2045 and 2050 (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (GHG-5). Alternative 4 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Amendment, but still would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2045 and 2050 (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (GHG-5). Alternative 5 would result in lower GHG emissions compared to the proposed Amendment, but still would not meet the reduction target reference points for 2045 and 2050 (Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3).
Noise and Vibration					
2025	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2025 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Alternative 1 would have the same land use patterns as the proposed Amendment, and therefore expose similar sensitive receptors to high noise levels. Thus, Alternative 1 would result in noise and vibration impacts similar to the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2025 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Land use patterns would result in less compact development compared to the proposed Amendment, which could expose more sensitive receptors to high noise levels. Additionally, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2025 resulting in increased noise and vibration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2025 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Land use patterns under Alternative 3 would result in more compact development, which could result in exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise levels compared to the proposed Amendment. Additionally, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2025 resulting in decreased noise and vibration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 4 would result in significant impacts in 2025 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Alternative 4 would have the same land use patterns as the proposed Amendment, and therefore would expose similar sensitive receptors to high noise levels. Additionally, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2025 resulting in noise and vibration impacts similar to the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in significant impacts in 2025 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Land use patterns under Alternative 5 would result in more compact development, which could result in exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise levels compared to the proposed Amendment. Additionally, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2025 resulting in decreased noise and vibration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment.

Year	Alternative 1: No Project (the approved Plan)	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 4: Progressive Pricing and No Regional Road Usage Charge	Alternative 5: All Growth in Mobility Hubs, Progressive Pricing, and No Regional Road Usage Charge
2035	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2035 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Alternative 1 would have similar land use patterns as the proposed Amendment and therefore would expose similar sensitive receptors to high noise levels. However, Alternative 1 would result in a lower VMT compared to the proposed Amendment due to the inclusion of the regional road usage charge and would therefore result in decreased noise impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-1).	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2035 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Land use patterns would be less compact than with the proposed Amendment, which could expose more sensitive receptors to high noise levels. Additionally, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2035, resulting in increased noise and vibration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2035 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Land use patterns would be more compact than with the proposed Amendment, which could result in the exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise levels than the proposed Amendment. In addition, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2035, resulting in decreased noise and vibration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in significant impacts in 2035 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Alternative 4 would have similar land use patterns as the proposed Amendment and therefore would expose similar sensitive receptors to high noise levels. However, Alternative 4 would result in a lower VMT compared to the proposed Amendment due to the inclusion of the regional road usage charge and would therefore result in decreased noise impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-1).	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in significant impacts in 2035 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Land use patterns would be more compact than the proposed Amendment, which could result in the exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise levels than the proposed Amendment. In addition, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2035, resulting in decreased noise and vibration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment.
2050	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts in 2050 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Alternative 1 would have similar land use patterns as the proposed Amendment and therefore would expose similar sensitive receptors to high noise levels. However, Alternative 1 would result in a lower VMT compared to the proposed Amendment due to the inclusion of the regional road usage charge and would therefore result in decreased noise impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-1).	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in significant impacts in 2050 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Land use patterns would be less compact than with the proposed Amendment, which could expose more sensitive receptors to high noise levels. Additionally, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2050, resulting in increased noise and vibration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts in 2050 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Land use patterns would be more compact than with the proposed Amendment, which could result in the exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise levels than the proposed Amendment. In addition, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2050, resulting in decreased noise and vibration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in significant impacts in 2050 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Alternative 4 would have similar land use patterns as the proposed Amendment and therefore would expose similar sensitive receptors to high noise levels. However, Alternative 4 would result in a lower VMT compared to the proposed Amendment due to the inclusion of the regional road usage charge and would therefore result in decreased noise impacts compared to the proposed Amendment (Appendix E, Table E-1).	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in significant impacts in 2050 (NOI-1 and NOI-2). Land use patterns would be more compact than with the proposed Amendment, which could result in the exposure of fewer sensitive receptors to high noise levels than the proposed Amendment. In addition, regional growth and transportation network improvements would occur under this alternative by 2050, resulting in decreased noise and vibration impacts compared to the proposed Amendment.
Transportation					
2025	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impacts in 2025 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.
	Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2025 (TRA-2). Alternative 1 would result in a VMT per capita of 24.81 (home based) in 2025, which would be similar to proposed Amendment VMT per capita (Appendix E, Table E-1). Additionally, Alternative 1 would result in an increase in total VMT of 1,212,162 miles compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions, which is the same increase as for the proposed Amendment. Alternative 1 would result in similar impacts because it would achieve similar VMT reduction as the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2025 (TRA-2). Alternative 2 would result in VMT per capita of 25.4 (home-based) in 2025, which would be greater than the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.81 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Additionally, Alternative 2 would result in an increase in total VMT of 3,287,993 miles per day in year 2025, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase would be greater than the 1,212,162 mile increase for the proposed Amendment. Alternative 2 would result in increased impacts because it would not achieve as much VMT reduction as the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2025 (TRA-2). Alternative 3 would result in a slightly decreased VMT per capita of 24.5 (home-based) compared to the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.81 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 3 would result in an overall increase in total VMT of 214,988 miles per day in year 2025, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase in total VMT is 997,174 miles lower than the projected VMT increase under the proposed Amendment. Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts because it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2025 (TRA-2). Alternative 4 would result in a slightly decreased VMT per capita of 24.3 (home-based) compared to the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.81 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 4 would result in an overall decrease in total VMT of 495,110 miles per day in year 2025, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This reduction in total VMT is 1,707,272 miles lower than the projected VMT increase under the proposed Amendment. Alternative 4 would result in decreased impacts because it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2025 (TRA-2). Alternative 5 would result in a slightly decreased VMT per capita of 24.3 (home-based) compared to the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.81 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 5 would result in an overall decrease in total VMT of 657,199 miles per day in year 2025, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This reduction in total VMT is 1,869,361 miles lower than the projected VMT increase under the proposed Amendment. Alternative 5 would result in decreased impacts because it would achieve the highest VMT reduction compared to the

Year	Alternative 1: No Project (the approved Plan)	Alternative 2: 2019 Transportation Network with New Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 3: All Growth in Mobility Hubs and More Progressive Value Pricing and User Fee Policies	Alternative 4: Progressive Pricing and No Regional Road Usage Charge	Alternative 5: All Growth in Mobility Hubs, Progressive Pricing, and No Regional Road Usage Charge
					proposed Amendment and the other alternatives.
2035	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2035 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2025 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (TRA-2). Alternative 1 would result in a slightly decreased VMT per capita of 24.03 (home based) in 2035, compared to the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.38 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Additionally, Alternative 1 would result in an increase in total VMT of 2,141,053 miles per day in year 2035, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions, which is 1,262,500 miles fewer than the proposed Amendment. Alternative 1 would result in decreased impacts because it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (TRA-2). Alternative 2 would result in VMT per capita of 26.0 (home-based) in 2035, which would be greater than the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.38 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 2 would result in an increase in total VMT of 9,106,582 miles per day in year 2035, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase would be 5,703,029 miles greater than the proposed Amendment. Alternative 2 would result in increased impacts because it would not achieve as much VMT reduction as the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (TRA-2). Alternative 3 would result in a slightly decreased VMT per capita of 23.4 (home-based) in 2035 compared to the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.38 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 3 would result in an overall decrease in total VMT of 261,481 miles per day in year 2035, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This is 3,665,034 miles lower than the projected VMT increase under the proposed Amendment. Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts because it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (TRA-2). Alternative 4 would result in a slightly decreased VMT per capita of 23.6 (home-based) in 2035 compared to the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.38 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 4 would result in an overall increase in total VMT of 545,259 miles per day in year 2035, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase in total VMT is 2,858,294 miles lower than the projected VMT increase under the proposed Amendment. Alternative 4 would result in decreased impacts because it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2035 (TRA-2). Alternative 5 would result in a slightly decreased VMT per capita of 23.6 (home-based) in 2035 compared to the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.38 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 5 would result in an overall increase in total VMT of 643,035 miles per day in year 2035, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase in total VMT is 2,760,518 miles lower than the projected VMT increase under the proposed Amendment. Alternative 5 would result in decreased impacts because it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Amendment.
2050	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.	Less-than-Significant Impact (same) – Alternative 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact in 2050 for TRA-1. The impact of this alternative is the same as the proposed Amendment impact because this alternative would be consistent with adopted plans and programs.
	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 1 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (TRA-2). Alternative 1 would result in a slightly decreased VMT per capita of 23.99 (home-based) in 2050, compared to the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.29 (see Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 1 would result in an increase in total VMT of 5,008,108 miles per day in year 2050, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions, which is 1,111,085 miles fewer than the proposed Amendment. Alternative 1 would result in decreased impacts because it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (increased) – Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (TRA-2). Alternative 2 would result in VMT per capita of 26.5 (home-based) in 2050, which would be greater than the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.29 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 2 would result in an increase in total VMT of 14,218,978 miles per day in year 2050, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase would be 8,099,785 miles greater than the proposed Amendment. Alternative 2 would result in increased impacts because it would not achieve as much VMT reduction as the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (TRA-2). Alternative 3 would result in a slightly decreased VMT per capita of 23.3 (home-based) compared to the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.29 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 3 would result in an overall increase in total VMT of 2,331,061 miles per day in year 2050, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This is 3,788,132 miles lower than the projected VMT increased under the proposed Amendment. Alternative 3 would result in decreased impacts because it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (TRA-2). Alternative 4 would result in a slightly decreased VMT per capita of 23.4 (home-based) in 2050 compared to the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.29 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 4 would result in an overall increase in total VMT of 2,842,913 miles per day in year 2050, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase in total VMT is 3,276,280 miles lower than the projected VMT increased under the proposed Amendment. Alternative 4 would result in decreased impacts because it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Amendment.	Significant Impact (decreased) – Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact in 2050 (TRA-2). Alternative 4 would result in a slightly decreased VMT per capita of 23.3 (home-based) in 2050 compared to the proposed Amendment VMT per capita of 24.29 (Appendix E, Table E-1). Alternative 5 would result in an overall increase in total VMT of 2,641,317 miles per day in year 2050, as compared to Baseline Year 2016 conditions. This increase in total VMT is 3,477,876 miles lower than the projected VMT increased under the proposed Amendment. Alternative 5 would result in decreased impacts because it would achieve a higher VMT reduction than the proposed Amendment.

This page left intentionally blank.