

# Chapter 8                    **ALTERNATIVES**

In order to fully evaluate the environmental effects of a project, CEQA mandates that alternatives to a project be 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.” This chapter of the EIR identifies a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Collier Park Renovations Project Master Plan and evaluates the comparative merits of these alternatives.

The alternatives discussion is intended to focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would become more costly. Thus, in developing the alternatives to be analyzed, it is necessary to consider the objectives and the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project that have been identified in this EIR. As stated in Chapter 4, Project Description, the objectives of the proposed project are as follows:

- 1) Create a more effective use of open space and increase opportunities for recreational facilities.
- 2) Create a safer, more active-use park for the local community that discourages transient loitering and other illicit activities.
- 3) Acknowledge the historical aspects of Collier Park and the Spring House through overall design, renovation, and interpretation.
- 4) Create an environmentally friendly facility with energy and water conservation considerations central to the design elements.

As discussed in Chapter 5, Existing Conditions, Impacts, and Mitigation, implementation of the Collier Park Renovations Project Master Plan would result in potentially significant impacts associated with the following issues:

- Biological Resources (special status species)
- Cultural Resources (historical resources, archaeological resources, and paleontological resources)
- Geology and Soils (unstable soils and expansive soils)
- Noise (excessive noise levels and excessive groundborne vibration)

The proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. Mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce all potentially significant environmental impacts to below a level of significance.

Alternatives that were considered but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process are identified in Section 8.1 below. Four alternatives to the proposed project that would reduce or eliminate the potentially significant impacts resulting from the proposed project are analyzed in greater detail in Section 8.2 below. The alternatives to the proposed project include:

- No Project Alternative. Under this alternative, the proposed renovations to Collier Park would not be implemented.
- Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative. This alternative would rehabilitate the contributing features of the Collier Park historic district, including the drinking fountain, drainage channel, tennis court, and Spring House for use as indoor (enclosed) interpretive center. This alternative would implement the same improvements to the Panhandle, History Hill, and Collier Club House areas as are identified for the proposed project, except ~~it would not for replacement~~ the tennis courts ~~and or remove the~~ drainage channel; however, it would maintain, ~~while maintaining~~ historic old growth trees.
- Spring House Restoration Alternative. This alternative would restore the contributing features of the Collier Park historic district, including the Spring House, drinking fountain, drainage channel and tennis court. The Spring House would be restored to accurately depict the form, features, and character of the building as it appeared during the period of time in which it was used as a bottling works (“restoration period”). This alternative would implement the same improvements to the Panhandle and History Hill areas as are identified for the proposed project, except ~~for it would not replacement of~~ the tennis courts ~~and or remove the~~ drainage channel, and it would maintain the maintenance of historic old growth trees. Improvements to the Collier Club House area would not be implemented under this alternative.
- Reduced Development Alternative. This alternative would implement improvements to the Panhandle area and the Spring House (~~partial demolition/replacement with an outdoor interpretive center~~) similar to those identified for the proposed project. Improvements to the History Hill and Collier Club House areas would not be implemented under this alternative.
- ~~■ Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative. This alternative would mothball the Spring House to stabilize and protect the building from further deterioration while, in the long term, research on grants and other funding opportunities would be pursued for restoration, rehabilitation or repurposing of the structure. This alternative would implement the same improvements to the Panhandle, History Hill, and Collier Club House areas as are identified for the proposed project.~~

The evaluation of each alternative includes a comparative assessment of its impacts related to the environmental topics addressed in Chapter 5, Existing Conditions, Impacts, and Mitigation, and a discussion of the alternatives’ ability to meet the project objectives. A summary comparison of the potential impacts of the proposed project and the alternatives is presented in Table 8-1. A summary comparison of the consistency of the alternatives with the project objectives is presented in Table 8-2. As required under Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the environmentally superior alternative is identified in Section 8.3 below.

## 8.1 Alternatives Considered but Rejected

Based on the Review and Analysis of Development Alternatives document prepared by Keyser Marston Associates (2011), the following alternatives were initially considered as options for new facilities to be developed at Collier Park. However, none of these alternatives meet the requirement identified in Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines that an alternative to the project shall avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. In fact, some of these alternatives would increase impacts associated with traffic, noise, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the proposed project. Because none of the following alternatives would reduce the potentially significant impacts identified for the proposed project, they were rejected from further study.

- [Interpretive Center. Partial demolition and reconstruction of the Spring House for adaptive reuse as an outdoor interpretive center.](#)
- Day Care Facilities. Develop day care facilities at Collier Park that would support the provision of daytime training, supervision, recreation, and medical services for children of preschool age, the disabled, or the elderly.
- Commercial Recreation. Develop commercial recreation facilities at Collier Park that would provide the public with an entertainment or recreation activity for a fee, such as exercise stations, picnic pavilions, or mini-golf.
- Wellness Center/Spa. Develop wellness center and/or spa facilities at Collier Park for a business offering health services for the body and mind, such as skin care, massage, fitness, personal training, and nutrition consulting.

## 8.2 Evaluation of Alternatives

### 8.2.1 No Project Alternative

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires the No Project Alternative to be addressed in an EIR. Under the No Project Alternative, renovations to Collier Park would not be implemented. The existing facilities in the Panhandle area would continue to be used for recreational purposes. The Spring House would remain in its existing deteriorated condition and would continue to be closed to the public and unfit for occupancy. The eastern and northern portions of the park (History Hill and Collier Club House areas) would remain undeveloped.

#### 8.2.1.1 Impact Analysis

##### Aesthetics

The No Project Alternative would not result in any impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources within a state scenic highway, visual character, and new sources of light and glare because no changes would be made to the project site. The History Hill and Collier Club House areas of the park would continue to provide low quality views of disturbed vegetation, and no new light fixtures would be constructed under this alternative.

## Air Quality

The No Project Alternative would result in reduced air pollutant emissions compared to the proposed project because no construction would be required and additional vehicle trips would not be generated. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to applicable air quality plans, air quality standards, cumulatively considerable emissions, sensitive receptors, and objectionable odors would be less than significant under this alternative.

## Biological Resources

The No Project Alternative would avoid the potentially significant impact to nesting birds that would occur under the proposed project because no construction would be required. No impact would occur and no mitigation would be required. Similar to the proposed project, no significant impacts would occur related to sensitive natural communities, jurisdictional waters and wetlands, wildlife corridors and nursery sites, biological resources protection policies or ordinances, or adopted habitat conservation plans.

## Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would avoid the potentially significant impact to historical resources that would occur under the proposed project because no changes would be made to the park, including contributing elements to the [NRHP and CRHR National Register](#) eligible [Collier Park historic district such as park property including](#) the Spring House, concrete-lined drainage channel, concrete rubble bridge and stairway, ~~embossed 1925 sewer manhole~~, tennis court, reconstructed drinking fountain, or historic ~~trees~~ [landscaping](#). Additionally, the No Project Alternative would avoid the potentially significant impacts related to archaeological resources and paleontological resources because no ground-disturbing activities would occur. No impacts to cultural resources would occur and no mitigation would be required. The No Project Alternative would not have the potential to disturb any human remains because no construction would occur. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to human remains would be less than significant.

## Geology and Soils

The No Project Alternative would avoid the potentially significant impacts related to unstable and expansive soils that would occur under the proposed project because no grading or new development would occur. The less than significant impacts related to soil erosion and topsoil loss would also be reduced under this alternative because no construction would occur and no alterations to the existing drainage system would be made. However, no changes to the Spring House would be made under this alternative. The existing Spring House, which is structurally unstable due to damage and deterioration over time, could present a significant hazard during strong seismic ground shaking. Therefore, impacts related to seismic hazards would be increased under this alternative. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable without improvements to the existing Spring House.

## Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The No Project Alternative would result in a reduced less than significant impact compared to the proposed project because no new greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) would result from this alternative. No construction would be required and no increase in vehicle trips would occur which would create

additional GHGs. Therefore, no impacts related to GHG emissions or compliance with plans, policies, or regulations to reduce GHG emissions would occur.

## Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As compared to the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would result in reduced less than significant impacts related to the use of hazardous materials and hazards to schools because no construction would be required, and no increase in operational use would occur. These types of activities typically require the use of standard construction and maintenance-related hazardous materials. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related hazardous materials sites, wildland fires, and airport safety hazards would be less than significant. Closure of Pasadena Avenue would not be required under this alternative; therefore, the less than significant impacts to emergency response and evacuation plans that would occur under the proposed project would be slightly reduced under this alternative.

## Hydrology and Water Quality

The No Project Alternative would not result in any changes to the existing hydrology of the project site, or result in any construction or new operational activities that would generate a new source of water quality pollutants. No impact would occur. No mitigation would be required, similar to the proposed project. [However, the existing drainage condition in the Pandhandle currently results in localized flooding, which would continue to occur under this alternative. Therefore, impacts related to flood hazards would be greater under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.](#) Similar to the proposed project, no impacts would occur related to ~~flood hazards~~, seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows.

## Noise

The potentially significant excessive noise impact identified for the proposed project would be avoided under this alternative because the outdoor event area would not be constructed in the northern portion of the park under this alternative. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not result in a significant noise impact related to operation of HVAC equipment at the Collier Club House due to compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance. The potentially significant groundborne vibration impact associated with construction of the proposed project within 200 feet of vibration-sensitive dental offices would be avoided, and the less than significant construction noise impact identified for the proposed project would be reduced, because no construction would occur under this alternative. Less than significant permanent increases in noise levels as a result of traffic noise would be avoided because no increase in traffic would occur. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to aircraft noise would be less than significant.

## Transportation and Traffic

The No Project Alternative would not generate additional park visitors or result in any increase in vehicle trips; therefore, less than significant impacts to circulation system performance would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not result in a significant impact related to hazardous design features. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not implement alternative transportation facility improvements (pedestrian, bicycle and bus) to improve the existing pedestrian facilities in and around the project site that are considered deficient including sub-standard sidewalks, missing sidewalks, sub-standard and steep access ramps, and other sub-standard access issues. Therefore, impacts related to alternative transportation facilities would be

greater under this alternative as compared to the proposed project. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable under this alternative unless pedestrian facility improvements would be implemented.

### 8.2.1.2 Ability to Attain Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the four project objectives. The No Project Alternative would not meet Objective 1 because it would not create a more effective use of open space or increase recreational opportunities. It would not meet Objective 2 because it would not create a safer, more active-use park that discourages loitering and illicit activities. It would not meet Objective 3 because the Spring House would continue to deteriorate and be uninhabitable under this alternative. Finally, the No Project Alternative would not meet Objective 4 because it would not implement any improvements on the site to encourage energy and water conservation.

## 8.2.2 Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative

The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would rehabilitate several elements in the Panhandle area and the existing Spring House structure to make possible an efficient contemporary use of the building through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those structural features which convey its historical value. The Spring House, as a contributing element to the Collier Park historic district, would be rehabilitated for use as an indoor interpretive center. Other elements that contribute to the Collier Park historic district, including the concrete-lined drainage channel, concrete rubble bridge and stairway, ~~embossed 1925 sewer manhole~~, tennis court, reconstructed drinking fountain, and historic trees, would remain in place and be rehabilitated similar to the Spring House. Therefore, this alternative would differ from the proposed project because the tennis court would not be demolished and relocated, the drainage channel would not be replaced with a bioswale, and old growth trees would not be removed throughout the park. The remaining Panhandle area renovations would occur as identified for the proposed project, including the new restroom facility and play areas. Rehabilitation of the Spring House structure and other contributing features to the Collier Park historic district would be performed in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, which are as follows:

- 1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
- 2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
- 3) Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
- 4) Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
- 5) Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
- 6) Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in

design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

- 7) Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
- 8) Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
- 9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- 10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The proposed renovations for the Collier Club House and History Hill areas would be implemented as identified for the proposed project, but would incorporate the historic old-growth trees on the project site, which would result in some design changes, such as realignment of walking paths.

### **8.2.2.1 Impact Analysis**

#### **Aesthetics**

The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would result in similar aesthetic impacts compared to the proposed project because the same renovations would be made to the Panhandle, Collier Club House, and History Hill areas. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would substantially change the character of some areas of the site from undeveloped to developed parkland. However, the alternative would improve the visual quality of the park which currently provides several low visual quality views of disturbed hillsides. Additionally, the Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would be consistent with the Scenic Preservation Overlay Zone requirements that apply to the project site. Impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and visual character would be less than significant. This alternative would result in the same less than significant impact related to nighttime lighting as the proposed project because compliance with La Mesa Municipal Code Section 24.05.020.D.15 would prevent disturbances to surrounding residences from new light sources.

#### **Air Quality**

The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would result in slightly higher criteria air pollutant emissions compared to the proposed project due to the operation of the indoor interpretive center, which will require electricity. However, the minor increase in air emissions associated with this increase in energy use would not be expected to exceed emission thresholds. Similar construction activities would be required, and this alternative would generate a similar number of vehicle trips during operation because the same or similar park facilities would be provided, including the event areas. Therefore, criteria pollutant emissions would be less than significant and would not be cumulatively considerable. Similar to the proposed project, the Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would not induce growth that would conflict with an air quality plan, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant

concentrations, or generate objectionable odors. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

## Biological Resources

The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would result in the same potentially significant impact to nesting birds that would occur under the proposed project because construction would occur near trees, shrubs, and man-made structures (e.g., buildings) that provide suitable nesting habitat. Mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, no significant impacts would occur related to sensitive natural communities, jurisdictional waters and wetlands, wildlife corridors and nursery sites, biological resources protection policies or ordinances, or adopted habitat conservation plans.

## Cultural Resources

The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would reduce the potentially significant impact to historical resources that would occur under the proposed project because features contributing to the Collier Park historic district, including the Spring House, would be rehabilitated rather than demolished, removed or relocated. The Spring House structure would be rehabilitated in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, ~~which would reduce impacts to the structure itself to a less than significant level.~~ In addition, other contributing features of the Collier Park historic district including the concrete-lined drainage channel, concrete rubble bridge and stairway, ~~embossed 1925 sewer manhole,~~ tennis court, reconstructed drinking fountain, and historic trees throughout the park would be left in place and rehabilitated per the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Therefore, no significant impact would occur to the contributing elements of the [NRHP and CRHR eligible Collier Park historic district](#) ~~National Register eligible park property~~ and no mitigation would be required. The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would result in the same potentially significant impacts related to archaeological resources and paleontological resources as the proposed project because similar ground-disturbing activities would occur. Mitigation measures CUL-3 and CUL-4 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to human remains would be less than significant with compliance with existing regulations.

## Geology and Soils

This Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would result in similar impacts related to seismic hazards because rehabilitation of the Spring House would include improvements to the building to meet structural requirements for seismic safety. Less than significant impacts related to soil erosion and top soil loss would be similar to the proposed project with implementation of dust control measures and best management practices (BMPs) during construction. Similar to the proposed project, the construction that would occur under this alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to unstable soils and expansive soils. Mitigation measures GEO-1 and GEO-2 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

## Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would result in similar construction-related GHG emissions but slightly higher operational GHG emissions due to the operation of the indoor interpretive center, which will require electricity. However, the minor increase would not be expected to exceed emission thresholds. In addition, this alternative would generate similar vehicle trips as the proposed project.



Impacts related to GHG emissions and compliance with plans, policies, and regulations to reduce GHG emissions are anticipated to be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

## Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts related to the use of hazardous materials and hazards to schools because similar types and quantities of hazardous materials would be used during construction and operational activities. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related hazardous materials sites, wildland fires, and airport safety hazards would be less than significant. This alternative would require the temporary closure of Pasadena Avenue during construction and would result in a similar less than significant impact to emergency response and evacuation plans as identified for the proposed project.

## Hydrology and Water Quality

Similar to the proposed project, the Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would have the potential to generate pollutants during construction and operational activities; however, compliance with existing regulations would reduce impacts related to water quality standards to a less than significant level. The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would not include drainage system improvements such as the replacement of the existing concrete-lined channel with a bioswale and bioinfiltration basin. Therefore, the Spring House Restoration Alternative would not implement Low Impact Development features, as required in the City's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan. Additionally, the existing drainage feature may not be adequate to convey post-project flows. Therefore, impacts associated with drainage alteration would be greater than those identified for the proposed project and would be potentially significant. Similar to the proposed project, no impacts would occur related to flood hazards, seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows.

## Noise

The potentially significant excessive noise impact identified for the proposed project would still occur under this alternative because the Collier Club House outdoor event area would be constructed under this alternative. Mitigation measures NOI-1, NOI-2, and NOI-3 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not result in a significant noise impact related to operation of HVAC equipment at the Collier Club House due to compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance. A potentially significant groundborne vibration impact would also occur under this alternative because construction would occur in the Panhandle area, near existing vibration-sensitive dental offices. Mitigation measures NOI-4 and NOI-5 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Construction noise would be less than significant with compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance, similar to the proposed project. Less than significant permanent increases in noise levels would occur similar to the proposed project because this alternative would result in a similar increase in vehicle trips. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to aircraft noise would be less than significant.

## Transportation and Traffic

The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would result in a similar increase in vehicle trips; therefore, impacts to circulation system performance would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not result in a significant impact related

to hazardous design features. The alternative transportation facility improvements identified for the proposed project (pedestrian, bicycle and bus) would be implemented under this alternative. Therefore, less than significant impacts related to alternative transportation facilities for this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

### 8.2.2.2 Ability to Attain Project Objectives

The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would meet all of the four project objectives. The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would meet Objective 1 because it would create a more effective use of open space and would increase recreational opportunities in the History Hill and Collier Club House areas. It would meet Objective 2 because it would create a safer, more active-use park that discourages loitering and illicit activities. It would meet Objective 3 because it acknowledges the historical aspects of Collier Park by restoring the elements that contribute to the Collier Park historic district, including the Spring House, concrete-lined drainage channel, concrete rubble bridge and stairway, ~~embossed 1925 sewer manhole~~, tennis court, reconstructed drinking fountain, and historic trees. Finally, the Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would meet Objective 4 because it would implement improvements on the park site to encourage energy and water conservation.

### 8.2.3 Spring House Restoration Alternative

The Spring House Restoration Alternative would restore the existing Spring House to accurately depict the form, features, and character of the building as it appeared during the period of time in which it was used a bottling works (“restoration period”) by removing features from other periods in its history and reconstructing missing features from the restoration period. This includes restoration of the concrete-lined drainage channel, concrete rubble bridge and stairway, ~~embossed 1925 sewer manhole~~, tennis court, reconstructed drinking fountain, and historic trees that are considered contributing features. Therefore, the tennis court would not be demolished and relocated, the drainage channel would not be replaced with a bioswale, and old growth trees would not be removed throughout the park. The remaining Panhandle area renovations would occur as identified for the proposed project, including the new restroom facility and play areas. Restoration of the Spring House and other contributing features to the Collier Park historic district and would be performed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Restoration, which are as follows:

- 1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use which reflects the property's restoration period.
- 2) Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the restoration period will not be undertaken.
- 3) Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.
- 4) Materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be documented prior to their alteration or removal.

- 5) Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.
- 6) Deteriorated features from the restoration period will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.
- 7) Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.
- 8) Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
- 9) Archeological resources affected by a project will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
- 10) Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

The proposed renovations for the History Hill area would be implemented as identified for the proposed project, but would incorporate the historic old-growth trees on the project site, which would result in some design changes, such as realignment of walking paths. This alternative would not implement improvements associated with the Collier Club House phase, including the club house building, outdoor event area, or northern parking lot.

### 8.2.3.1 Impact Analysis

#### Aesthetics

The Spring House Restoration Alternative would result in reduced aesthetic impacts compared to the proposed project because no renovations would be made to the Collier Club House area. This area would remain undeveloped and no change in visual character or quality would occur. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would substantially change the character of the History Hill area from undeveloped to developed parkland. However, the alternative would improve the visual quality of the History Hill area which currently provides low visual quality views of disturbed hillsides. The renovations to the Panhandle area and Spring House would be similar to the existing character of the park, but would improve visual quality by replacing deteriorated facilities. Similar to the proposed project, the Spring House Restoration Alternative would be consistent with the Scenic Preservation Overlay Zone requirements that apply to the project site. Impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and visual character would be less than significant. This alternative would result in a similar less than significant impact related to nighttime lighting as the proposed project because compliance with La Mesa Municipal Code Section 24.05.020.D.15 would prevent disturbances to surrounding residences from new light sources in the History Hill area.

#### Air Quality

The Spring House Restoration Alternative would result in reduced less than significant criteria air pollutant emissions compared to the proposed project. The Collier Club House phase would not be constructed, less construction would be required, fewer vehicle trips would be generated and energy

usage would be reduced during operation because event facilities in this area would not be provided. The reduction in air emissions from the elimination of the Collier Club House development would more than offset the operation of the restored Spring House building, which will result in a slight increase in electricity usage. Therefore, criteria pollutant emissions under this alternative would be less than significant and would not be cumulatively considerable. Similar to the proposed project, the Spring House Restoration Alternative would not induce growth that would conflict with an air quality plan, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or generate objectionable odors. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

## Biological Resources

The Spring House Restoration Alternative would result in the same potentially significant impact to nesting birds that would occur under the proposed project because construction would occur near trees, shrubs, and man-made structures (e.g., buildings) that provide suitable nesting habitat. Mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, no significant impacts would occur related to sensitive natural communities, jurisdictional waters and wetlands, wildlife corridors and nursery sites, biological resources protection policies or ordinances, or adopted habitat conservation plans.

## Cultural Resources

The Spring House Restoration Alternative would avoid the potentially significant impact to historical resources that would occur under the proposed project because the contributing features to the Collier Park historic district, including the Spring House, concrete-lined drainage channel, concrete rubble bridge and stairway, ~~embossed 1925 sewer manhole~~, tennis court, reconstructed drinking fountain, and historic trees, would be restored in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Restoration. This alternative would not result in any adverse changes to the contributing elements to the [NRHP and CRHR Collier Park historic district](#) ~~National Register eligible park property~~. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

The Spring House Restoration Alternative would result in the same potentially significant impacts related to archaeological resources and paleontological resources as the proposed project because ground-disturbing activities would occur, although at a reduced level because the Collier Club House phase would not be constructed. Nonetheless, mitigation measures CUL-3 and CUL-4 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to human remains would be less than significant with compliance with existing regulations.

## Geology and Soils

This Spring House Restoration Alternative would result in similar impacts related to seismic hazards because restoration of the Spring House would include improvements to the building to meet structural requirements for seismic safety. Less than significant impacts related to soil erosion and top soil loss would be similar to the proposed project with implementation of dust control measures and BMPs during construction. The construction that would occur under this alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to unstable soils and expansive soils associated with development of the Panhandle and History Hill phases. However, impacts to unstable soils and expansive soils would be reduced as compared to the proposed project because the Collier Club House phase would not be constructed. Nonetheless, mitigation measures GEO-1 and GEO-2 would be required to reduce impacts associated with this alternative to a less than significant level.

## Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Spring House Restoration Alternative would result in reduced construction-related GHG emissions compared to the proposed project because construction of the Collier Club House area would not occur. Operations emissions would also be reduced under this alternative because energy use and vehicle trips associated with the proposed Collier Club House event facilities would not occur under this alternative. This alternative would result in slightly higher operational GHG emissions associated with operation of the restored Spring House building, which will require electricity. However, the reduction in emissions from reduced vehicle trips associated with the elimination of the Collier Club House development would more than offset the increase in emissions associated with the Spring House. Therefore, impacts related to GHG emissions or compliance with plans, policies, and regulations to reduce GHG emissions would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

## Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Spring House Restoration Alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts related to the use of hazardous materials and hazards to schools because similar types and quantities of hazardous materials would be used during construction and operational activities. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to hazardous materials sites, wildland fires, and airport safety hazards would be less than significant. This alternative would require the temporary closure of Pasadena Avenue during construction and would result in a similar less than significant impact to emergency response and evacuation plans as identified for the proposed project.

## Hydrology and Water Quality

The Spring House Restoration Alternative would result in similar changes to the existing hydrology of the project site, and would have the potential to generate the same pollutants during construction and operational activities. Similar to the proposed project, compliance with existing regulations would reduce construction impacts to a less than significant level. The Spring House Restoration Alternative would not include drainage system improvements such as the replacement of the existing concrete-lined channel with a bioswale and bioinfiltration basin. Therefore, the Spring House Restoration Alternative would not implement Low Impact Development features, as required in the City's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan. Additionally, the existing drainage feature may not be adequate to convey post-project flows. Therefore, impacts associated with drainage alteration would be greater than those identified for the proposed project and would be potentially significant. Similar to the proposed project, no impacts would occur related to flood hazards, seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows.

## Noise

The potentially significant excessive noise impact identified for the proposed project would be avoided under this alternative because the Collier Club House outdoor event area would not be constructed. No mitigation measure would be required for this issue. No noise impacts related to operation of the Collier Club House HVAC equipment would occur under this alternative because no development would occur in the Collier Club House area. A potentially significant groundborne vibration impact would still occur under this alternative because construction would occur in the Panhandle area, near existing vibration-sensitive dental offices. Mitigation measures NOI-4 and NOI-5 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Construction noise would be less than significant with compliance with the

City's Noise Ordinance, similar to the proposed project. Less than significant permanent increases in noise levels would occur similar to the proposed project because this alternative would result in a similar increase in vehicle trips. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to aircraft noise would be less than significant.

## Transportation and Traffic

The Spring House Restoration Alternative would result in a smaller increase in vehicle trips compared to the proposed project because event facilities would not be developed in the Collier Club House area. Therefore, impacts to circulation system performance would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not result in a significant impact related to hazardous design features. Similar alternative transportation facility improvements (pedestrian, bicycle and bus) identified for the proposed project would be implemented under this alternative. Therefore, less than significant impacts related to alternative transportation facilities for this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

### 8.2.3.2 Ability to Attain Project Objectives

The Spring House Restoration Alternative would meet two of the four project objectives, would partially meet two objectives. The Spring House Restoration Alternative would partially meet Objective 1 because it would create a more effective use of open space and would increase recreational opportunities in the History Hill area but not the Collier Club House area. It would partially meet Objective 2 because it would create a safer, more active-use park in the Panhandle and History Hill areas; however, the Collier Club House area would remain undeveloped and would not include features to discourage loitering and illicit activities. This alternative would meet Objective 3 because it acknowledges the historical aspects of Collier Park by restoring the contributing elements to the Collier Park historic district, including the Spring House, concrete-lined drainage channel, concrete rubble bridge and stairway, embossed 1925 sewer manhole, tennis court, reconstructed drinking fountain, and historic trees. Finally, the Spring House Restoration Alternative would meet Objective 4 because it would implement improvements that promote on the park site that promote energy and water conservation.

## 8.2.4 Reduced Development Alternative

The Reduced Development Alternative would implement improvements to the Panhandle area and the Spring House (~~partial demolition/replacement with outdoor interpretive center~~) as identified under the proposed project, but would not implement improvements to the History Hill and Collier Club House areas. The eastern and northern portions of the park (History Hill and Collier Club House areas) would remain undeveloped under this alternative.

### 8.2.4.1 Impact Analysis

#### Aesthetics

The Reduced Development Alternative would result in reduced impacts compared to the proposed project because no renovations would be made to the Collier Club House or History Hill areas. These areas would remain undeveloped and no change in visual character or quality would occur. The renovations to the Panhandle area and Spring House would be similar to the existing character of the

park ~~and would improve visual quality by replacing deteriorated facilities.~~ Impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and visual character would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project. This alternative would result in a reduced less than significant impact related to nighttime lighting than would occur under the proposed project because this alternative would only renovate areas of the park with existing lighting features in the Panhandle and Spring House [areas](#) ~~phases~~. These areas currently provide nighttime lighting and are not located adjacent to residential lots; therefore, spillover from new lighting features would not occur.

## Air Quality

The Reduced Development Alternative would result in reduced less than significant criteria air pollutant emissions compared to the proposed project. Because the Collier Club House and History Hill phases would not be constructed, less construction would be required and fewer vehicle trips would be generated during operation because the event facilities would not be provided. Criteria pollutant emissions would be less than significant and would not be cumulatively considerable. Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Development Alternative would not induce growth that would conflict with an air quality plan, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or generate objectionable odors. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

## Biological Resources

The Reduced Development Alternative would result in the same potentially significant impact to nesting birds that would occur under the proposed project because construction would occur near trees, shrubs, and man-made structures (e.g., buildings) that provide suitable nesting habitat. Mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would be required. Similar to the proposed project, no significant impacts would occur related to sensitive natural communities, jurisdictional waters and wetlands, wildlife corridors and nursery sites, biological resources protection policies or ordinances, or adopted habitat conservation plans.

## Cultural Resources

The Reduced Development Alternative would result in the same significant impact to historical resources that would occur under the proposed project because the same improvements would be implemented to the Spring House and other historic features under this alternative. Therefore, a potentially significant impact to historical resources would occur. Mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level similar to the proposed project. The Reduced Development Alternative would result in the same potentially significant impacts related to archaeological resources and paleontological resources as the proposed project because ground-disturbing activities would occur, although they would be reduced because construction of the Collier Club House and History Hill phases would not occur. Mitigation measures CUL-3 and CUL-4 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to human remains would be less than significant with compliance with existing regulations.

## Geology and Soils

This Reduced Development Alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts related to seismic hazards as the proposed project because the Spring House [would include improvements to the building to meet structural requirements pursuant to the La Mesa Municipal Code Title 14 and the California Building Code to ensure that the building is structurally sound.](#) ~~interpretive center would be~~

~~constructed in accordance with structural requirements for seismic safety.~~ Less than significant impacts related to soil erosion and top soil loss would be similar to the proposed project with implementation of dust control measures and best management practices (BMPs) during construction. The construction that would occur under this alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to unstable soils and expansive soils. However, impacts to unstable soils and expansive soils would be reduced as compared to the proposed project because the Collier Club House and History Hill phases would not be constructed. Nonetheless, mitigation measures GEO-1 and GEO-2 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level similar to the proposed project.

## Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Reduced Development Alternative would result in reduced construction GHG emissions compared to the proposed project because construction would not be required for the Collier Club House or History Hill areas. Operations emissions would also be reduced under this alternative because energy usage and vehicle trips associated with the proposed event facilities at the Collier Club House or History Hill areas would not occur under this alternative. Therefore, impacts related to GHG emissions and compliance with plans, policies, and regulations to reduce GHG emissions would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

## Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Reduced Development Alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts related to use of hazardous materials and hazards to schools because similar types and quantities of hazardous materials would be used during construction and operation. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to hazardous materials sites and airport safety hazards would be less than significant. This alternative would require closure of Pasadena Avenue similar to the proposed project; therefore, similar less than significant impacts to emergency response and evacuation plans would occur under this alternative. Impacts related to airport hazards and wildland fires would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

## Hydrology and Water Quality

The Reduced Development Alternative would result in similar changes to drainage in the Panhandle area, and would have the potential to generate the same pollutants during construction and operational activities. Similar to the proposed project, compliance with existing regulations and implementation of the proposed drainage system, including replacement of the existing concrete-lined channel with a bioswale and bioinfiltration basin, would reduce impacts related to water quality standards and drainage alteration to a less than significant level. The less than significant hydrology impact would be reduced as compared to the proposed project because no construction or changes to existing hydrology would occur in the History Hill and Collier Club House areas. Similar to the proposed project, no impacts would occur related to flood hazards, seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows.

## Noise

The potentially significant excessive noise impact identified for the proposed project would be avoided under this alternative because the Collier Club House outdoor event area would not be constructed. No mitigation measure would be required for this issue. No noise impacts related to operation of the Collier Club House HVAC equipment would occur under this alternative because no development would occur



in the Collier Club House area. Similar to the proposed project, a potentially significant groundborne vibration impact would occur under this alternative because construction would occur in the Panhandle area, near existing vibration-sensitive dental offices. Mitigation measures NOI-4 and NOI-5 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Construction noise would be less than significant with compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance, similar to the proposed project. Less than significant permanent increases in noise level as a result of traffic noise would be reduced under this alternative because this alternative would not generate vehicle trips associated with the outdoor event area and amphitheater. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to aircraft noise would be less than significant.

## Transportation and Traffic

The Reduced Development Alternative would result in a smaller increase in vehicle trips compared to the proposed project because the event facilities would not be developed in the Collier Club House and History Hill areas. Therefore, impacts to circulation system performance would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not result in a significant impact related to hazardous design features. The alternative transportation facility improvements (pedestrian, bicycle and bus) proposed for the project in the Panhandle area would be implemented under this alternative. Therefore, less than significant impacts related to alternative transportation facilities would be similar to the proposed project.

### 8.2.4.2 Ability to Attain Project Objectives

The Reduced Development Alternative would meet two of four project objectives, would partially meet one objective, and would not meet one objective. This alternative would meet Objective 3 because it acknowledges the historical aspects of Collier Park ~~by constructing an interpretive center~~, similar to the proposed project. It would also meet Objective 4 because it would implement improvements on the site to encourage energy and water conservation. This alternative would partially meet Objective 2 because it would create safer, more active-use recreational facilities in the Panhandle area; however, the Collier Club House and History Hill areas would remain undeveloped and would not include features to discourage loitering and illicit activities. The Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative would not meet Objective 1 because it would not create a more effective use of the open space in the Collier Club House and History Hill areas and would not increase recreational opportunities as compared to the existing condition of the park.

## ~~8.2.5 Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative~~

~~Under the Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative, the existing Spring House structure would be mothballed by a qualified historic architect to stabilize and protect the building from further deterioration while, in the long-term, research on grants and other funding opportunities would be pursued for restoration, rehabilitation or repurposing of the structure. Mothballing is the process of closing and protecting a building from weather and vandalism (Park 1993). Under this alternative, the proposed renovations for the Panhandle, Collier Club House and History Hill areas would be implemented as identified for the proposed project.~~

### 8.2.5.1 Impact Analysis

#### Aesthetics

The Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would result in similar aesthetic impacts compared to the proposed project because the same renovations would be made to the Panhandle, Collier Club House, and History Hill areas. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would substantially change the character of some areas of the site from undeveloped to developed parkland. However, the alternative would improve the visual quality of the park which currently provides several low visual quality views of disturbed hillsides. There would be no change to views of the Spring House. Additionally, the Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would be consistent with the Scenic Preservation Overlay Zone requirements that apply to the project site. Impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and visual character would be less than significant. This alternative would result in the same less than significant impact related to nighttime lighting as the proposed project because compliance with La Mesa Municipal Code Section 24.05.020.D.15 would prevent disturbances to surrounding residences from new light sources.

#### Air Quality

The Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would result in slightly reduced criteria air pollutant emissions compared to the proposed project because no interpretive center would be constructed; thus, less construction would be required under this alternative, resulting in fewer criteria air pollutant emissions. This alternative would generate a similar number of vehicle trips during operation because the same or similar park facilities would be provided, including the event areas. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, criteria pollutant emissions would be less than significant and would not be cumulatively considerable. Similar to the proposed project, the Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would not induce growth that would conflict with an air quality plan, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or generate objectionable odors. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

#### Biological Resources

The Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would result in the same potentially significant impact to nesting birds that would occur under the proposed project because construction would occur near trees, shrubs, and man-made structures (e.g., buildings) that provide suitable nesting habitat. Mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, no significant impacts would occur related to sensitive natural communities, jurisdictional waters and wetlands, wildlife corridors and nursery sites, biological resources protection policies or ordinances, or adopted habitat conservation plans.

#### Cultural Resources

The Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would reduce the potentially significant impact to historical resources that would occur under the proposed project because the Spring House would be mothballed to maintain existing conditions. None of the structure's contributing features would be demolished, removed or relocated. Impacts to the other contributing features of the Collier Park historic district including the concrete-lined drainage channel, concrete rubble bridge and stairway, embossed 1925 sewer manhole, tennis court, reconstructed drinking fountain, and historic trees throughout the park would be the same as identified for the proposed project. Mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 would reduce impacts to the other contributing features to a less than significant level. The Spring

House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would result in the same potentially significant impacts related to archaeological resources and paleontological resources as the proposed project because similar ground disturbing activities would occur. Mitigation measures CUL-3 and CUL-4 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to human remains would be less than significant with compliance with existing regulations.

## Geology and Soils

This Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would result in slightly increased impacts related to seismic hazards because the Spring House would continue to fail to meet structural requirements for seismic safety and could present a significant hazard during strong seismic ground shaking. Less than significant impacts related to soil erosion and top soil loss would be similar to the proposed project with implementation of dust control measures and best management practices (BMPs) during construction. Similar to the proposed project, construction that would occur under this alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to unstable soils and expansive soils. Mitigation measures GEO-1 and GEO-2 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

## Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would result in slightly lower construction-related GHG emissions, and similar operational GHG emissions compared to the proposed project. Construction activities at the Spring House would be reduced under this alternative, because the interpretive center would not be constructed; however, this alternative would generate similar vehicle trips as the proposed project during operation. Impacts related to GHG emissions and compliance with plans, policies, and regulations to reduce GHG emissions would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

## Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts related to the use of hazardous materials and hazards to schools because similar types and quantities of hazardous materials would be used during construction and operational activities. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related hazardous materials sites, wildland fires, and airport safety hazards would be less than significant. This alternative would require the temporary closure of Pasadena Avenue during construction and would result in a similar less than significant impact to emergency response and evacuation plans as identified for the proposed project.

## Hydrology and Water Quality

Similar to the proposed project, the Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would have the potential to generate pollutants during construction and operational activities; however, compliance with existing regulations would reduce impacts related to water quality standards to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, the Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would include drainage system improvements such as the replacement of the existing concrete-lined channel with a bioswale and bioinfiltration basin. This alternative would implement Low Impact Development features, as required in the City's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan. Therefore, impacts associated with drainage alteration would be similar to those identified for the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, no impacts would occur related to flood hazards, seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows.

## Noise

The potentially significant excessive noise impact identified for the proposed project would still occur under this alternative because the Collier Club House outdoor event area would be constructed under this alternative. Mitigation measures NOI-1, NOI-2, and NOI-3 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not result in a significant noise impact related to operation of HVAC equipment at the Collier Club House due to compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance. A potentially significant groundborne vibration impact would also occur under this alternative because construction would occur in the Panhandle area, near existing vibration-sensitive dental offices. Mitigation measures NOI-4 and NOI-5 would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Construction noise would be less than significant with compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance, similar to the proposed project. Less than significant permanent increases in noise levels would occur similar to the proposed project because this alternative would result in a similar increase in vehicle trips. Similar to the proposed project, impacts related to aircraft noise would be less than significant.

## Transportation and Traffic

The Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would result in a similar increase in vehicle trips and less than significant impact to circulation system performance as the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not result in a significant impact related to hazardous design features. The alternative transportation facility improvements identified for the proposed project (pedestrian, bicycle and bus) would be implemented under this alternative. Therefore, less than significant impacts related to alternative transportation facilities for this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

### 8.2.5.2 Ability to Attain Project Objectives

The Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would meet all of the four project objectives. The Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would meet Objective 1 because it would create a more effective use of open space and would increase recreational opportunities in the Panhandle, History Hill and Collier Club House areas. It would meet Objective 2 because it would create a safer, more active use park that discourages loitering and illicit activities. It would meet Objective 3 because it acknowledges the historical aspects of Collier Park by maintaining the existing Spring House structure. Finally, the Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative would meet Objective 4 because it would implement improvements on the park site to encourage energy and water conservation.

## 8.3 Environmentally Superior Alternative

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative (i.e., the alternative having the potential for the fewest significant environmental impacts) from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. Table 8-1 provides a summary comparison of each alternative to the proposed project with the purpose of highlighting whether the alternative would result in a similar, greater, or lesser impact than the proposed project. The Spring House Restoration Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. This alternative would avoid the significant but mitigable impacts identified for the proposed project related to excessive noise levels because the Collier Club House outdoor event area would not be constructed, and would avoid the significant but mitigable

impacts related to historic resources because the contributing features to the Collier Park historic district, including the Spring House, concrete-lined drainage channel, concrete rubble bridge and stairway, ~~embossed 1925 sewer manhole~~, tennis court, drinking fountain, and historic trees, would be restored in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Restoration. This alternative would also reduce impacts associated with archaeological resources, paleontological resources, unstable soils, and expansive soils as compared to the proposed project, although these impacts would still require mitigation. In addition, the Spring House Restoration Alternative would increase impacts associated with site drainage/hydrology as compared to the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would only fully meet two of the project objectives and partially meet the remaining two objectives. Furthermore, this alternative may not be economically feasible given the high cost of restoration. A summary of how each alternative fulfills the project objectives is provided in Table 8-2.

**Table 8-1 Summary of Impacts for Alternatives Compared to the Proposed Project**

Issue Area	Proposed Project			Alternatives			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	No Project Alternative	Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative	Spring House Restoration Alternative	Reduced Development Alternative	Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative
Key: S = Significant Impact; LS = Less than Significant Impact; N/A = Not Applicable ▲ Alternative would result in an increased level of impact when compared to the proposed project. = Alternative would result in a similar level of impact when compared to proposed project. ■ Alternative would result in a reduced level of impact when compared to the proposed project, but impacts would remain significant without mitigation. ▼ Alternative would result in a reduced level of impact to issue when compared to proposed project and would not require mitigation.							
<b>5.1 Aesthetics</b>							
Scenic Vistas	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Visual Character	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
New Sources of Light and Glare	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
<b>5.2 Air Quality</b>							
Applicable Air Quality Plan	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Air Quality Standards	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	▼
Cumulatively Considerable Emissions	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	▼
Sensitive Receptors	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Objectionable Odors	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
<b>5.3 Biological Resources</b>							
Special Status Species	S	LS	▼	=	=	=	=
Sensitive Natural Communities	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Wildlife Corridors, Linkages, and Nursery Sites	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Biological Resources Protection Policies or Ordinances	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Adopted Habitat Conservation Plan	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
<b>5.4 Cultural Resources</b>							
Historical Resources	S	LS	▼	▼	▼	=	▼
Archaeological Resources	S	LS	▼	=	■	■	=
Paleontological Resources	S	LS	▼	=	■	■	=
Human Remains	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
<b>5.5 Geology and Soils</b>							
Seismic Hazards	LS	N/A	▲	=	=	=	▲
Soil Erosion and Topsoil Loss	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Unstable Soils	S	LS	▼	=	■	■	=
Expansive Soils	S	LS	▼	=	■	■	=
<b>5.6 Greenhouse Gases</b>							
Direct and Indirect Generation of GHG Emissions	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	▼
Applicable GHG Emissions Reduction Plan, Policy, or Regulation	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=

Table 8-1 continued

Issue Area	Proposed Project			Alternatives			
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	No Project Alternative	Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative	Spring House Restoration Alternative	Reduced Development Alternative	Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative
Key: S = Significant Impact; LS = Less than Significant Impact; N/A = Not Applicable ▲ Alternative would result in an increased level of impact when compared to the proposed project. = Alternative would result in a similar level of impact when compared to proposed project. ■ Alternative would result in a reduced level of impact when compared to the proposed project, but impacts would remain significant without mitigation. ▼ Alternative would result in a reduced level of impact to issue when compared to proposed project and would not require mitigation.							
<b>5.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>							
Use of Hazardous Materials	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Hazards to Schools	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Hazardous Materials Sites	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Airports Safety Hazards	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Wildland Fires	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
<b>5.8 Hydrology and Water Quality</b>							
Water Quality Degradation	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Drainage Alterations	LS	N/A	=	▲	▲	=	=
Flood Hazards	LS	N/A	▲	=	=	=	=
Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflows	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
<b>5.9 Noise</b>							
Excessive Noise Levels	S	LS	▼	=	▼	▼	=
Excessive Groundborne Vibration	S	LS	▼	=	=	=	=
Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Airport Noise	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
<b>5.10 Transportation/Traffic</b>							
Circulation System Performance	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Hazardous Design Features	LS	N/A	=	=	=	=	=
Alternative Transportation Facilities	LS	N/A	▲	=	=	=	=

**Table 8-2 Ability of Alternatives to Meet Project Objectives**

<b>Project Objectives</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Spring House Rehabilitation Alternative</b>	<b>Spring House Restoration Alternative</b>	<b>Reduced Development Alternative</b>	<b>Spring House Deterioration Prevention Alternative</b>
1) Create a more effective use of open space and increase opportunities for recreational facilities.	No	Yes	Partial	No	Yes
2) Create a safer, more active-use park for the local community that discourages transient loitering and other illicit activities.	No	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes
3) Acknowledge the historical aspects of Collier Park and the Spring House through overall design, renovation, and interpretation.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4) Create an environmentally friendly facility with energy and water conservation considerations central to the design elements.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes