
6.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

State CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(a) requires that an EIR "...describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or 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." The objectives of the proposed project are stated in Section 3.2 (Project Purpose and Objectives) of this EIR. Alternatives are used to determine whether or not a variation of the proposed project would reduce, or eliminate, significant project impacts, within the basic framework of the objectives. State CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(f) specifies that the range of alternatives is governed by the "rule of reason," requiring evaluation of only those alternatives "necessary to permit a reasoned choice." Further, an EIR "...need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative (State CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(f)(3))."

6.1.1 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS POTENTIALLY AVOIDED THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The purpose of this section is to summarize the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project, as identified and discussed in Chapter 4 (Environmental Setting, Thresholds of Significance, Environmental Impacts, and Mitigation Measures) of this EIR, to aid in consideration of the project alternatives. An analysis of the ability or inability of the various project alternatives to avoid or substantially reduce the potentially significant impacts of the project is presented in the following section.

Potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project include:

- Alteration of scenic vistas, alteration of the existing visual character of the project site, and increased nighttime lighting (Section 4.1: Aesthetics).
- Loss of Grazing Land (± 292.55 acres), Farmland of Local Importance (± 2.37 acres), and Farmland of Statewide Importance (± 12.46 acres), and land use changes possibly leading to conversion of off-site agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses. (Section 4.2: Agricultural Resources).
- Construction-related air quality emissions as well as exceedances of the County's Level "A" thresholds for NO_x and possibly VOCs. In addition, future residents could be exposed to odors, dust, and other air pollutants from nearby agricultural and industrial operations (Section 4.3: Air Quality).
- Loss of fox sedge plants, loss of habitat potentially capable of supporting 13 special-status wildlife species, loss of ± 154 acres of blue oak woodland, fill of

±0.6 acres of streams and wetlands, and possible “take” of nesting migratory birds (Section 4.4: Biological Resources).

- Discovery of subsurface cultural resources during construction activities. However, because all alternatives have similar potential for discovery of subsurface cultural resources, evaluation of the potential for such discovery does not contribute to meaningful alternatives analysis and is not further addressed.
- Increased potential for wildland and structural fires, and increased demand for Cottonwood Fire Protection District services. Increased noise levels during project construction, exposure of future site residents on lots within 750 feet of the Union Pacific Railroad centerline to high noise levels, and exposure of future site residents on lots within 70 feet of the Locust Road centerline to high noise levels (Section 4.11: Noise).
- Increased traffic congestion at intersections and along roadways in the local area, with impact significance thresholds being exceeded at two locations: the Gas Point Road/Interstate 5 (I-5) NB ramps intersection and the Riverside Avenue/I-5 NB ramps intersection. In addition, pedestrian and bicycle safety could be compromised, and emergency access and ingress/egress to the project site would be inadequate (Section 4.15: Transportation and Traffic).
- Contribution to potentially significant cumulative impacts, including increased greenhouse gas emissions and increased traffic congestion.

6.1.2 CONSIDERATION OF OFF-SITE ALTERNATIVES

State *CEQA Guidelines* §15126.6(c), state: "The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered ... but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process ... 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."

Factors used to identify potential off-site alternatives were that the sites had to be within the Cottonwood Community Plan Area, be designated for residential development under the General Plan, be at least 200 acres in size, and be undeveloped or sparsely developed. Current land ownership and availability for development were not evaluated. Using these criteria, two potential off-site alternatives were located: one in the northeastern portion of the Cottonwood Community Plan area and the other in the northwest.

The two sites would have impacts similar to the proposed project with respect to aesthetics; agricultural use; oak woodlands, wetlands and other biological resources; wildland fire; and traffic; and would have less impacts with respect to noise because they are farther from the railroad tracks and principal highway corridors. However, both sites are located farther from the Cottonwood town center and traffic arterials than the proposed Panorama Planned Development. Development of these sites would require longer extensions of utility lines, require greater extension of Cottonwood Water District

and County Service Area No. 17 boundaries, and would not readily allow for integration with the existing road, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic routes. In addition to direct impacts, the off-site alternatives would result in greater greenhouse gas emissions and have a higher potential for growth inducement than would the proposed project.

The off-site alternatives would not avoid the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, and would likely result in additional significant impacts; further, the availability of off-site lands for development is speculative. For these reasons, off-site alternatives have been eliminated from further consideration.

6.1.3 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

State CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(e) requires that, among other alternatives, a "no-project" alternative be evaluated, and that the analysis "discuss the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with the available infrastructure and community services." Accordingly, one no-project alternative is analyzed in this EIR, and addresses development of the site under current Shasta County General Plan land use classifications and Shasta County Zoning Plan designations.

In addition, two other "development" alternatives have been evaluated. One of these alternatives assumes clustered development of the site, while capping the development at 153 dwelling units (du), which assumes that the project site would be developed under the current General Plan designation, would be rezoned to Planned Development, and would qualify for the associated 25 percent density bonus. The other alternative assumes construction of 430 du, which is the same as currently proposed, but the units would be more tightly clustered on smaller parcels to reduce the development footprint and maximize open space.

Descriptions of the project alternatives are provided below. An analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative, compared to the proposed project, and the ability or inability of the alternatives to avoid or substantially reduce the significant effects of the project is presented.

6.2 ALTERNATIVES

6.2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: DEVELOPMENT UNDER EXISTING GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS (NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE)

PRINCIPAL CHARACTERISTICS

Alternative 1 assumes that the project site would be developed in accordance with the existing *Shasta County General Plan* and *Shasta County Zoning Plan* designations. The project site includes ±240 acres of Rural Residential "A" with RR zoning, and ±67

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

acres of Rural Residential “B” with R-L-T zoning. The two existing General Plan/zoning designations would allow up to one dwelling unit per two acres, and up to one dwelling unit per five acres, respectively. However, Shasta County restricts development with these General Plan/zoning designations in areas with greater than 30 percent slope. Approximately 19 acres of the land zoned RR has a slope greater than 30 percent. Given the slope constraints, and current General Plan and zoning designations, up to approximately 123 dwelling units could be constructed on the project site. Dwelling units would be distributed across the whole of the project site; units may be developed in groups or individually.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

This section describes the potential environmental impacts resulting from Alternative 1 for each of the environmental factors considered in Section 6.1.1 of this EIR.

Aesthetics

Alternative 1 would affect project site aesthetics in a fashion similar to the proposed project, as both would involve residential development of the project site. However, under Alternative 1, development would not occur as a Planned Development, and development units may or may not include an overall design standard, depending on County requirements.

Unlike the proposed project, there would not be any particular area set aside as designated open space. However, some trees would remain in the utility line rights-of-way. Additionally, the larger (mostly two-acre) lots under Alternative 1 would probably result in tree retention throughout the site, albeit in lower densities than would occur in the proposed project greenbelts. Tree retention within lots would be minimal under the current project proposal. Overall, tree retention would probably be similar under the proposed project and Alternative 1.

Construction of roads would be more widespread with this alternative, as more roads would be needed to allow access to the entirety of the developable lands. This would result in a greater aesthetic impact (increased paving and tree removal) than the proposed project.

Certain foreground views, such as from Vantage Drive and Jim Dandy Drive, would offer a more rural landscape than anticipated with the proposed project. Distant views would most likely be similar.

Nighttime lighting intensity would be less under Alternative 1 than that with the proposed project, as fewer homes would be built. However, more roads would be constructed under this alternative than with the proposed project, so there could be somewhat more street lighting.

Overall, aesthetic impacts under Alternative 1 would be similar to somewhat less than those with the proposed project.

Agricultural Resources

Under Alternative 1, land use on the project site would change from seasonal grazing to suburban residential. Although fewer homes would be constructed than with the proposed project, conflicts associated with placement of residential uses immediately adjacent to active agricultural uses could still occur. This conflict could be reduced with implementation of the mitigation measures identified for the proposed project. The two-acre minimum lot size under this alternative would allow for some hobby-type farming; however, commercial agricultural use is unlikely. Agricultural impacts resulting from the Alternative 1 would be similar but slightly less than those of the proposed project.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This alternative would include the reduction of the overall number of the homes on the project site, which would result in construction of 307 less homes than the proposed project. Under Alternative 1, construction-related air quality impacts (including greenhouse gas emissions) would be similar, though reduced proportionately, to the proposed project. In addition, long-term air quality degradation (including greenhouse gas emissions) resulting from Alternative 1 would be proportionately lower because of reduced traffic volumes in and surrounding the project site. This alternative is substantially superior to the proposed project with respect to minimizing air quality impacts.

Biological Resources

Alternative 1 would affect project site biological resources in a fashion similar to the proposed project, as both would involve residential development of the project site. Although Alternative 1 would not include designated open space, tree retention is expected to be similar to that of the proposed project. Although trees in residential lots would provide some habitat values (e.g., for nesting birds), the overall habitat value of the site would be lower under Alternative 1 in that it would provide less opportunity for wildlife migration, increased harassment of wildlife by domestic pets, preservation of fewer snags and less downed woody debris (both of which are important for wildlife), and increased loss of stream and wetland values. The proposed project is substantially superior to Alternative 1.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials/Public Services

Alternative 1 would result in a lower risk of wildland and structural fires, and lower demand for fire protection services, as fewer residences would be constructed. However, additional capital improvements and staffing for the Cottonwood Fire Protection District would still be needed. Funding for the needed improvements and personnel would be provided through existing fee mechanisms, including establishment of a Community Facilities District or similar mechanism to provide for additional staffing. Because provision of funding commensurate with the increase in demand for services would be a condition of project approval, the impacts of Alternative 1 would be the same as those of the proposed project.

Noise

Alternative 1 would result in the construction of approximately 123 dwelling units. As such, the duration of the construction period noise would be reduced when compared to the proposed project, with 430 dwelling units. However, implementation of construction-related mitigation measures would reduce the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level under either alternative.

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 1 would expose new residential units to traffic and railroad noise sources. Alternative 1 would result in fewer residents being subjected to noise impacts (due to the lower density) compared to the proposed project, although installation of noise walls, setbacks, and landscaping would still be required, as noise levels would still be a significant impact. With mitigation incorporated, impacts resulting from the Alternative 1 and the proposed project are essentially equivalent.

Transportation and Traffic

As development would occur across the whole of the site under Alternative 1, traffic would be expected to ingress/egress the site in a similar fashion as the proposed project. However, Alternative 1 would result in construction of substantially fewer homes and would result in approximately 1/3 the number of vehicle trips on surrounding roadways and intersections. Direct, indirect, and cumulative traffic impacts would be reduced. With regard to transportation and traffic impacts, Alternative 1 is substantially superior to the proposed project.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Alternative 1 would meet many of the project objectives outlined in Section 3.2: Project Purpose and Objectives. However, the variety of housing types would presumably be less, as no small lots would be available. Additionally, bicycle and pedestrian paths would be less likely to be constructed, and the energy efficiency measures required under the Planned Development designation may not be incorporated into the project. Whether or not future development would include open space or include overall design guidelines would be determined by how the land is developed (i.e., in large units/neighborhoods, or in individual parcels); this would be dependent on County requirements. Implementation of Alternative 1 would be in accordance with current *Shasta County General Plan* and *Shasta County Zoning Plan* designations for the project site.

ANALYSIS SUMMARY FOR ALTERNATIVE 1

Alternative 1 would result in similar environmental impacts to the proposed project in the areas of aesthetics, agricultural resources, fire hazards/public services, and noise. Alternative 1 would most likely result in more environmental impacts than the proposed project with regard to biological resources, and less environmental impacts than the proposed project with regard to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation/traffic impacts. However, numerous mitigations are included in the proposed project to reduce most environmental impacts of the proposed project to a

less-than-significant level. Alternative 1 would achieve many, but not all, of the project proponent's objectives. Overall, Alternative 1 is somewhat superior to the proposed project.

6.2.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: CLUSTERED DEVELOPMENT OF 153 DWELLING UNITS

PRINCIPAL CHARACTERISTICS

Alternative 2 assumes that the project site would be developed in accordance with the existing *Shasta County General Plan* land use designations; however, the project site would be rezoned to a Planned Development and include the allowable 25 percent density bonus. This would allow for construction of a total of 153 dwelling units. The homes would be clustered in order to preserve open space, biological resources, and agricultural resources. It is assumed that all lots would be less than $\frac{1}{4}$ acre, and would be clustered in the northwestern portion of the proposed project site (in the areas planned for Phases 2 and 3 of the proposed project). The area of developed land would be approximately 60 acres. Open space and grazing land would be retained elsewhere on the project site. Municipal water and wastewater services would be needed to support the density of development.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

This section describes the potential environmental impacts resulting from Alternative 2 for each of the environmental factors identified in Section 6.1.1 of this EIR.

Aesthetics

Alternative 2 would result in less aesthetic impacts than the proposed project, as development would be confined to the northwestern portion of the project site. While it is assumed that all trees would be removed within the ± 60 -acre development footprint, the remainder of the project site could be retained as open space and/or grazing land. Undeveloped greenbelts would be present between some of the development areas.

Construction of roads would be limited under this alternative, as development would be confined to the northwestern portion of the project site. This would result in a lesser aesthetic impact (less paving and tree removal) than the proposed project.

Certain foreground views, such as from Locust Road near Vantage Drive would be relatively urban in character, while others such as from Jim Dandy Drive, would remain unchanged. Distant views of the northwestern portion of the project site would be similar to those of the proposed project.

Nighttime lighting intensity would be less under Alternative 2 than that with the proposed project, as fewer homes would be built. As the southern and western portions of the project site would remain undeveloped, there would be no nighttime lighting impacts in those areas.

Alternative 2 would be substantially superior to the proposed project with regard to aesthetic impacts.

Agricultural Resources

As development would be confined to the northwestern portion of the project site, existing agricultural uses on the remainder of the project site could continue. No Farmland of Local Importance or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be affected. This alternative is substantially superior to the proposed project with respect to minimizing agricultural impacts.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Because Alternative 2 would result in construction of fewer homes than the proposed project, construction-related air quality impacts (including greenhouse gas emissions) would be reduced proportionately. In addition, long-term air quality degradation (including greenhouse gas emissions) resulting from Alternative 2 would be proportionately lower because of reduced traffic volumes in and surrounding the project site. This alternative is substantially superior to the proposed project with respect to minimizing air quality impacts.

Biological Resources

Alternative 2 would result in less biological resources impacts than the proposed project, as development would be confined to the northwestern portion of the project site. While it is assumed that all trees would be removed within the development footprint, oak woodlands could be retained throughout the remainder of the project site. The reduced project footprint would maximize values for wildlife through retention of streams, wetlands, oaks, snags, and downed woody debris, and increased buffering from the adverse impacts of domestic pets associated with residential use. This alternative is substantially superior to the proposed project with respect to minimizing biological resources impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials/Public Services

Alternative 2 would result in a lower risk of wildland and structural fires, and lower demand for fire protection services, as fewer residences would be constructed. However, additional capital improvements and staffing for the Cottonwood Fire Protection District would still be needed. Funding for the needed improvements and personnel would be provided through existing fee mechanisms, including establishment of a Community Facilities District or similar mechanism to provide for additional staffing. Because provision of funding commensurate with the increase in demand for services would be a condition of project approval, the impacts of Alternative 2 would be the same as those of the proposed project.

Noise

Alternative 2 would result in the construction of approximately 153 dwelling units. As such, the duration of the construction period noise would be reduced when compared to

the proposed project, with 430 dwelling units. However, implementation of construction-related mitigation measures would reduce the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level under either alternative.

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would expose new residential units to traffic noise from Locust Road. However, railroad noise impacts would be eliminated. Installation of noise walls, setbacks, or landscaping along Locust Road may still be required, as noise levels would still be a significant impact. With mitigation incorporated, impacts resulting from the Alternative 2 and the proposed project are essentially equivalent.

Transportation and Traffic

As compared with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would result in construction of substantially fewer homes and would result in approximately 1/3 the number of vehicle trips on surrounding roadways and intersections. Direct, indirect, and cumulative traffic impacts would be reduced. As development would be confined to the northwestern portion of the project site, southern access would be unnecessary. This alternative is substantially superior to the proposed project with regard to transportation and traffic impacts.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Alternative 2 would meet most of the project objectives outlined in Section 3.2: Project Purpose and Objectives. However, the variety of housing types would presumably be less, as lots would be uniformly small. Extension of public services, such as water supply and wastewater disposal, may be less affordable as the development would be clustered at the fringe of the Cottonwood Community Plan area.

ANALYSIS SUMMARY FOR ALTERNATIVE 2

Alternative 2 would result in less environmental impacts than the proposed project in all alternative impact analysis areas, with the exceptions of fire hazards/public services and noise. Alternative 2 would most likely result in similar environmental impacts to the proposed project with regard to fire hazards/public services and noise impacts. Alternative 2 would achieve most of the project proponent's objectives. However, numerous mitigations are included in the proposed project to reduce most environmental impacts of the proposed project to a less-than-significant level. Nonetheless, Alternative 2 is substantially superior to the proposed project.

6.2.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: CLUSTERED DEVELOPMENT OF 430 DWELLING UNITS ON SMALLER PARCELS

PRINCIPAL CHARACTERISTICS

Alternative 3 assumes that the project site would be developed with the same number of residences as the current project proposal (i.e., 430 dwelling units). However, the homes would be clustered on smaller parcels in order to preserve open space,

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

biological resources, and agricultural resources. It is assumed that all lots would be less than $\frac{1}{4}$ acre, and would be clustered in the northern ± 190 -acre portion of the proposed project site (in the areas planned for Phases 2, 3, 5 (north of RV storage area), 6, 7, and 8 of the proposed project). The area of developed land would be approximately 150 acres; approximately 40 acres would be retained as transmission line corridor and open space. Additional open space and/or grazing land would be retained elsewhere on the project site. Municipal water and wastewater services would be needed to support the density of development.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

This section describes the potential environmental impacts resulting from Alternative 3 for each of the environmental factors identified in Section 6.1.1 of this EIR.

Aesthetics

Alternative 3 would result in less aesthetic impacts than the proposed project, as development would be confined to the northern two-thirds of the project site. While it is assumed that all trees would be removed within the development footprint, approximately half of the project site could be retained as open space and/or grazing land.

Construction of roads would be somewhat limited with this alternative, as development would be confined to the northern two-thirds of the project site. This would result in a lesser aesthetic impact (less paving) than the proposed project.

Certain foreground views, such as from Locust Road near Vantage Drive would be relatively urban in character, while others such as from Jim Dandy Drive, would remain unchanged. Distant views of the northern portion of the project site would be similar to those of the proposed project.

Nighttime lighting intensity of Alternative 3 would be similar to that of the proposed project. As the southwestern portions of the project site would remain undeveloped, there would be no nighttime lighting impacts in that area.

Alternative 3 is substantially superior to the proposed project with regard to aesthetic impacts.

Agricultural Resources

As development would be confined to the northern two-thirds of the project site, existing agricultural uses on the remainder of the project site could continue. No Farmland of Local Importance or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be affected. This alternative is substantially superior to the proposed project with respect to minimizing agricultural impacts.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under Alternative 3, construction-related and operational air quality impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions, would be similar to the proposed project. This alternative is essentially equivalent to the proposed project with respect to air quality impacts.

Biological Resources

Alternative 3 would result in less biological resources impacts than the proposed project, as development would be confined to the northern two-thirds of the project site. While it is assumed that all trees would be removed within the development footprint, oak woodlands could be retained throughout the remainder of the project site. The reduced project footprint would increase values for wildlife through retention of streams, wetlands, oaks, snags, and downed woody debris, and increased buffering from the adverse impacts of domestic pets associated with residential use. This alternative is substantially superior to the proposed project with respect to minimizing biological resources impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials/Public Services

Alternative 3 would result in a similar demand for fire protection services as the proposed project. Additional capital improvements and staffing for the Cottonwood Fire Protection District would be needed. Funding for the needed improvements and personnel would be provided through existing fee mechanisms, including establishment of a Community Facilities District or similar mechanism to provide for additional staffing. Because provision of funding commensurate with the increase in demand for services would be a condition of project approval, the impacts of Alternative 3 would be the same as the proposed project.

Noise

Under Alternative 3, construction-related noise impacts would be similar to the proposed project.

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would expose new residential units to traffic noise from Locust Road. However, railroad noise impacts would be eliminated. Installation of noise walls, setbacks, or landscaping along Locust Road may still be required, as noise levels would still be a significant impact. With mitigation incorporated, impacts resulting from the Alternative 3 and the proposed project are essentially equivalent.

Transportation and Traffic

As development would be confined to the northern two-thirds of the project site, traffic patterns would be somewhat different from those of the proposed project. However, overall traffic volumes would be equivalent to those of the proposed project, and Alternative 3 is essentially equivalent to the proposed project with regard to transportation/traffic impacts.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Alternative 3 would meet nearly all of the project objectives outlined in Section 3.2: Project Purpose and Objectives. However, the variety of housing types would presumably be less, as lots would be uniformly small.

ANALYSIS SUMMARY FOR ALTERNATIVE 3

Alternative 3 would result in less environmental impacts than the proposed project in the areas of aesthetics, agricultural resources, and biological resources. Alternative 3 would most likely result in similar environmental impacts to the proposed project with regard to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, fire hazards/public services, noise, and transportation/traffic impacts. Alternative 3 would achieve nearly all of the project proponent's objectives. However, numerous mitigations are included in the proposed project to reduce most environmental impacts of the proposed project to a less-than-significant level. Nonetheless, Alternative 3 is substantially superior to the proposed project.

6.3 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Of the three alternatives evaluated, Alternative 2 (Clustered Development of 153 Dwelling Units) is the environmentally superior alternative, based on the potential for fewer impacts with respect to aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, and transportation/traffic. Table 6.1 provides a qualitative comparison of the three alternatives, showing whether they have more, less, or similar impacts as contrasted with the proposed project.

**Table 6.1
Qualitative Comparison of Project Alternatives with the Proposed Project**

Potential Impact Area	Alternative 1: No Project - Development under Existing General Plan and Zoning Designations	Alternative 2: Clustered Development of 153 Dwelling Units	Alternative 3: Clustered Development of 430 Dwelling Units On Smaller Parcels
	<i>Would the Alternative Result in Similar, Greater, or Lower Impacts than the Proposed Project?</i>		
Aesthetics	Similar	Lower	Lower
Agricultural Resources	Similar	Lower	Lower
Air Quality/GHG	Lower	Lower	Similar
Biological Resources	Greater	Lower	Lower
Fire Hazards/Public Services	Similar	Similar	Similar
Noise	Similar	Similar	Similar
Transportation and Traffic	Lower	Lower	Similar

End of Section.

