

SECTION 5: ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.1 - Introduction

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this DEIR contains a comparative impact assessment of alternatives to the Proposed Project. The primary purpose of this section is to provide decision makers and the general public with a reasonable degree of feasible project alternatives that could attain most of the basic project objectives, while avoiding or reducing any of the project's significant adverse environmental effects. Important considerations for these alternatives analyses are noted below (as stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6):

- An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project;
- An EIR should identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process;
- Reasons for rejecting an alternative include:
 - Failure to meet most of the basic project objectives;
 - Infeasibility; or
 - Inability to avoid significant environmental effects.

5.1.1 - Project Objectives

As stated in Section 3.0, Project Description, the City's objectives for the Proposed Project are to:

- Improve overall usability of the park for all segments of the City population;
- Improve security and accessibility of the park for park users;
- Maintain or enhance views into and out of the park for security;
- Minimize intrusion of park activities into surrounding neighborhoods;
- Reduce or minimize maintenance and security costs to the City; and
- Take advantage of available funding within allowed time limits.

5.1.2 - Proposed Project – Significant Impacts

This EIR did not identify an significant unavoidable impacts of the Proposed Project after implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, therefore, no alternatives need to be developed to eliminate one or more significant project impacts as required by CEQA. However, the City will consider alternatives that may reduce anticipated (but less than significant) impacts, or will improve the acceptability or successful implementation of the planned park improvements.

5.1.3 - Alternatives Evaluated But Rejected as Infeasible

During preliminary development of the Proposed Project, City Parks staff reviewed a number of different kinds of improvements to the park, but focused on those that would maximize the level of use of or activities in the park for the least cost. City staff researched various surface options for the soccer field to determine which would provide the most cost effective surface with the best and

longest wear. Various landscaping and walkway changes were discussed, along with the extent of landscaping that would need to be relocated versus that which had to be removed. Both the Signal Building and the Boathouse Building need different kinds of rehabilitation and renovation to maximize their internal flexibility and areas of use.

For those reasons, a variety of alternatives that are similar to the proposed park improvements were rejected because they would cause different or considerably more or greater environmental impacts compared to the Proposed Project.

The State CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to consider “**alternative sites**” if relocating a proposed project would reduce one or more significant impacts of the project. The planned improvements to MacArthur Park were proposed to alleviate a number of physical deficiencies or needs identified with the existing park facilities. Therefore, moving these improvements to another site would not achieve the objectives of the Proposed Project, and many of the proposed improvements, if conducted at another park facility, would still result in similar impacts to those identified in this DEIR. Therefore, alternative sites are not a feasible way to reduce potentially significant impacts of the Proposed Project and were rejected.

5.1.4 - Alternatives Selected for Detailed Analysis

The three alternatives to the Proposed Project selected to be analyzed in this section are as follows:

- **Alternative 1 - No Project – No Improvements:** The project site would remain in its existing condition and the Proposed Project would not be developed.
- **Alternative 2 – Modified Soccer Field Improvements:** Grading and installation of a soccer field with an artificial or synthetic surface and lighting may generate controversy in the local community, so this alternative examines eliminating the field lighting and using natural turf for the proposed soccer field renovation.
- **Alternative 3 – No Boathouse Improvements:** The air quality assessment for the project indicated that most of the air pollutants from the Project, other than dust, would be generated by demolition of the Boathouse. In addition, plans have not yet been developed for this aspect of the Project, so this alternative looks removing demolition and construction of a new boathouse building.

The following sections analyze these three potentially feasible alternatives to the Proposed Project. This analysis compares the Proposed Project and each individual project alternative. In several cases, the description of the impact may be the same under each alternative when compared with the CEQA Thresholds of Significance (i.e., both alternatives would result in a “Less than Significant Impact”). The actual degree of impact may be slightly different under each alternative, and this relative difference is the basis for a conclusion of greater or lesser impacts.

5.2 - No Project – No Improvements Alternative

5.2.1 - Description of Alternative

Under is alternative, none of the planned improvements to MacArthur Park would be completed and thus any short-term impacts from construction and long-term or contributions to cumulative impacts implementation of the planned park improvements (even though they were determined to be less than significant under CEQA) would be avoided.

5.2.2 - Impact Analysis

This alternative would eliminate the potential impacts of the proposed park improvements, including air pollutant emissions during demolition and construction as well as incremental contributions to cumulative air quality impacts. This alternative would also reduce any impacts associated with increased lighting for the soccer field or the use of a synthetic surface for the field. However, all of these potential project impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

This alternative would not allow for the most efficient use of the Signal or Boathouse buildings, as well as allow continued use of the dirt soccer field. Eventually, reconstruction or regrading of the soccer field would be necessary to maintain safe playing conditions as a result of use and erosion. In addition, a number of safety improvements would be needed for the Boathouse and Signal buildings to continue to be used in a safe manner. Therefore, this alternative would most likely only postpone the need for the planned improvements. In addition, funding for these improvements have certain time limits, which might preclude their implementation if they are delayed beyond the funding deadlines. Therefore, this alternative increases impacts related to erosion and hazards, but does reduce electrical and water consumption compared to the Proposed Project.

5.2.3 - Conclusion

Alternative 1 - No Project – No Improvements would eliminate any potential impacts identified with construction or operation of the Proposed Project. However, many of the planned improvements would still need to be installed at some point for safety reasons, and there are timing limitations to the funding for these improvements. Therefore, this alternative is rejected in favor of the Proposed Project.

5.3 - Alternative 2 – Modified Soccer Field Improvements

5.3.1 - Description of Alternative

Under is alternative, the dirt soccer field would be improved with natural turf only, and would not have any field lighting installed, but the rest of the park improvements would be made as planned.

5.3.2 - Impact Analysis

This alternative would eliminate potential controversy regarding use of a synthetic surface for the soccer field, as well as eliminate any concerns related to increased lighting related to the soccer field. However, this alternative would not allow for the most efficient use of the soccer field, and would not improve safety of field users. If natural turf is used, additional replanting with sod, seed, and possible regrading of the soccer field would be necessary to maintain safe playing conditions. In addition, a number of safety improvements would be needed for the Boathouse and Signal buildings to continue to be used in a safe manner. Therefore, this alternative may only postpone needed improvements. In addition, funding for these improvements have certain time limits, which might preclude their implementation if they are delayed beyond the funding deadlines.

5.3.3 - Conclusion

Alternative 2 – Modified Soccer Field Improvements may reduce local objection to synthetic field surfaces and night lighting of the soccer field. However, the soccer field would need continued maintenance to keep it in a playable condition, especially as wear and water erosion cause the surface to become more and more uneven (and unsafe). Some level of improvement would still be needed at some point for safety reasons, and there are timing limitations to the funding for these improvements. In addition, this alternative does not achieve the objectives of the project to nearly the same degree as the Proposed Project (in terms of year-round playability of the soccer field). Therefore, this alternative is rejected in favor of the Proposed Project.

5.4 - Alternative 3 – No Boathouse Improvements

5.4.1 - Description of Alternative

Under this alternative, replacement of the boathouse would be eliminated, but the rest of the park improvements would be made as planned.

5.4.2 - Impact Analysis

This alternative would eliminate air pollutant emissions from demolition of the existing building and construction of a new boathouse building. However, this alternative would not allow for the most efficient use of the boathouse, and would not improve safety for building users. Eventually, reconstruction or some form of rehabilitation would be necessary to maintain safe playing conditions. In addition, a number of improvements that are needed for the Boathouse Building to continue to be used in a safe manner. Therefore, this alternative may only postpone needed improvements. In addition, funding for these improvements have certain time limits, which might preclude their implementation if they are delayed beyond the funding deadlines.

5.4.3 - Conclusion

Alternative 3 – No Boathouse Improvements would air quality and other short-term impacts from demolition and reconstruction of a boathouse building. However, these impacts of the Proposed

Project were determined to be less than significant, and the Boathouse would only be a portion of those impact. If these improvements are not made, the Boathouse would still need continued maintenance to keep it in usable and safe condition. Some level of improvement would still be needed at some point for safety reasons, and there are timing limitations to the funding for these improvements. In addition, this alternative does not achieve the objectives of the project to nearly the same degree as the Proposed Project. Therefore, this alternative is rejected in favor of the Proposed Project.

5.5 - Environmentally Superior Alternative

The environmental effects of each alternative in relation to the Proposed Project are summarized in Table 5-1. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(e)(2) requires an EIR to identify an “environmentally superior alternative.” If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, as it is in this case, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives. The Proposed Project does not result in any significant impacts after implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Therefore, the identified alternatives may make the Project more acceptable to some members of the public, or assist in the implementation of the planned park improvements.

Table 5-1: Summary of Impacts* for Alternatives (Compared to Proposed Project)

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project*	Alternative 1 No Project – No Improvements	Alternative 2 Modified Soccer Field Improvements	Alternative 3 No Boathouse Improvements
Aesthetics, Light, and Glare	Increased lighting but less than significant*	No Impact	Reduced but still less than significant	Reduced but still less than significant
Air Quality Construction	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Operation (including green-house gases)	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Biological Resources	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Cultural Resources (historical)	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant but increased water consumption	Less than significant

Table 5-1: Summary of Impacts* for Alternatives (Compared to Proposed Project) (Cont.)

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project*	Alternative 1 No Project – No Improvements	Alternative 2 Modified Soccer Field Improvements	Alternative 3 No Boathouse Improvements
Noise	Less than significant	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Public Services (fire, police, parks)	Less than significant	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Utilities (water, energy, etc.)	Less than significant	No Impact	Less electrical use but increased water consumption	Less than significant
Transportation and Circulation	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Meets Project Objectives?	Yes	No	Not to same degree	Not to same degree
* with mitigation				

5.5.1 - Conclusion

The Proposed Project does not create any significant environmental impacts after implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. However, all of the alternatives do reduce short-term construction-related impacts to some degree (i.e., make fewer improvements). Alternative 2 would result in less consumption of electricity but increase water use (for turf irrigation). None of the alternatives achieve the objectives of the project to the same degree as the Proposed Project. Since none of the alternatives eliminates one or more significant impacts of the Project, and do not achieve the project objectives as well, none are considered environmentally superior to the Proposed Project and are therefore rejected in favor of the Proposed Project.