

Section 8: ALTERNATIVES

SECTION 8.0

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

8.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project, or a range of reasonable alternatives to the location of the Project, that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the Project. An EIR does not need to consider every conceivable alternative project, but it does have to consider a range of potentially feasible alternatives that will facilitate informed decision making and public participation.

Per Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the discussion of alternatives must include several different issues. The discussion of alternatives must focus on alternatives to the Project, or to the Project location, which will avoid or substantially reduce any significant effects of the Project, even if the alternatives would be more costly or hinder to some degree the attainment of the Project objectives. The “No Project” alternative must also be evaluated. The “No Project” analysis must discuss the existing conditions and what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project was not approved. The range of alternatives required is governed by a “rule of reason.” Therefore, the EIR must only evaluate those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives must be limited to only ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project.

Additionally, an EIR should not consider an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative. The CEQA Guidelines also require an EIR to state why an alternative is being rejected. If the County ultimately rejects any, or all alternatives, the rationale for rejection will be presented in the findings that are required before the County certifies the EIR and takes action on the Project. According to Section 15126.6(f)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing feasibility of alternatives

are environmental impacts, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the applicant could reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternate site.

The Project alternatives are evaluated to determine the extent to which they attain the basic Project objectives of the County, while significantly reducing or avoiding any significant effects of the Project. The Project objectives are outlined in Section 3.3, *Project Objectives*, in Chapter 3.0, *Project Description*, of this EIR.

The objectives of the Project include the following:

- Expand the existing EMJ Park by adding the former UVA site and potentially the UHC site;
- Provide a balance between both passive and active recreational uses that meet the demands of the community and surrounding area;
- Provide the opportunity for a wider range of recreational amenities and activities for the community and surrounding area;
- Provide the opportunity for a healthier community through an increase of physical exercise facilities and extensive trail system;
- Provide additional facilities where community gathering events can be held;
- Revitalize the northern lake to provide a safe water source for public fishing, paddle boating and kayak uses;
- Incorporate the proposed recommendation from the County’s Feasibility Analysis Second District Equestrian Facility (Withers & Sandgren/Integrated Consulting Group, July 2014);
- Provide basketball courts to support the legacy sport of the person for whom the park is named;
- Incorporate aquatic uses into the EMJ Park Master Plan to support the community’s high demand for this amenity;

- Provide adequate traffic access into and through the Project area;
- Provide adequate parking facilities within the Project area;
- Relocate the County DPR SAH, within the Project area, to better service the Project and community needs;
- Provide onsite operation and maintenance support; and
- Provide onsite security support.

The following significant and unavoidable impacts are associated with development of the proposed Project:

Noise

Impact 4.10-4: **The proposed Project would result in a significant vibration impacts from construction equipment to residences along the northern boundary and schools along the southwest boundary of EMJ Park. This impact would be *significant and unavoidable*.**

Recreation

Impact 4.12-2 **Implementation of the Project includes the expansion of a recreational facility and construction of additional amenities which will have an adverse physical effect on the environment. This impact would be *significant and unavoidable*.**

8.2 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

As noted previously, the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6(e)(2)) require that the alternatives discussion include an analysis of the "No Project" Alternative. Pursuant to CEQA, the "No Project" Alternative refers to the analysis of existing conditions (i.e., implementation of current plans) and what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project was not approved. Potential environmental impacts associated with three alternatives are compared below to assess impacts from the Project. These alternatives include: 1) "No Project" Alternative; 2) Alternative SAH

Location Alternative; and 3) Alternative Equestrian Center Location Alternative. Refer to Table 8-1, *Comparison of Alternatives*, for an impact matrix that compares the Alternatives to the proposed Project.

Table 8-1
Comparison of Alternatives

Topic	Alternative 1: “No Project” Alternative	Alternative 2: Alternative SAH Location Alternative	Alternative 3: Alternative Equestrian Center Location Alternative
Aesthetics, Light, and Glare	<	=	=
Air Quality	<	=	=
Biological Resources	<	=	=
Cultural Resources	=	=	=
Geological Resources	<	=	=
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<	=	=
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	=	=	=
Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality	>	=	=
Land Use	=	=	=
Noise	<	=	=
Public Services and Utilities	<	=	=
Recreation	>	=	=
Transportation and Circulation	<	=	>
Achieves Project Objectives	NO	YES	YES

- = Impact is equivalent to impact of proposed Project (neither environmentally superior nor inferior).
- < Impact is less than impact of proposed Project (environmentally superior).
- > Impact is greater than impact of proposed Project (environmentally inferior).

Table 8-2, *Project Objectives Consistency Analysis*, identifies objectives consistency for each of the proposed alternatives.

Table 8-2
Project Objectives Consistency Analysis

Project Objective	Alternative 1: “No Project” Alternative	Alternative 2: Alternative SAH Location Alternative	Alternative 3: Alternative Equestrian Center Location Alternative
	Consistent:	Consistent:	Consistent:
Expand the Existing EMJ Park by adding the former UVA property and potentially the UHC property	No	Yes	Yes
Provide a balance between both passive and active recreational uses that meet the demands of the community and surrounding area	No	Yes	Yes
Provide the opportunity for a wider range of recreational amenities and activities for the community and surrounding area	No	Yes	Yes
Provide the opportunity for a healthier community through an increase of physical exercise facilities and extensive trail system	No	Yes	Yes
Provide additional facilities where community gathering events can be held	No	Yes	Yes
Revitalize the northern lake to provide a safe water source for public fishing, paddle boating and kayak uses	No	Yes	Yes
Incorporate the proposed recommendation from the County’s Feasibility Analysis Second District Equestrian Facility (Withers & Sandgren/Integrated Consulting Group, July 2014)	No	Yes	Yes
Provide basketball courts to support the legacy sport of the person after whom the park is named	No	Yes	Yes
Incorporate aquatic uses into the Master Plan to support the community’s high demand for this amenity	No	Yes	Yes
Provide adequate traffic access into and through the Project area	Yes	Yes	Yes
Provide adequate parking facilities within the Project area	Yes	Yes	Yes
Relocate the SAH, within the Project area, to better service the Project and community needs	No	Yes	Yes
Provide onsite operation and maintenance support	No	Yes	Yes
Provide onsite security support	No	Yes	Yes

8.3 ALTERNATIVE 1: "NO PROJECT" ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The "No Project" Alternative (Alternative 1) assumes that the proposed Project would not be developed. Existing *County of Los Angeles General Plan* (1980) land use designations within the Project site (which would guide future development of the site) include Open Space and Low Density Residential (per exhibit 3.0-5).

The "No Project" Alternative assumes that no development would occur on the Project site, and EMJ Park would remain in its existing state. EMJ Park would continue to be open to the public as is currently allowed. However, no new or modified uses would be developed. Additionally, the former UVA site would continue to remain vacant and would not be redeveloped into park uses. As outlined in Table 8-2 Project Objectives Consistency Analysis above, this alternative does meet any of the project objectives with the exception of providing adequate traffic access and adequate parking. This is because the current traffic access and parking is adequate for the existing park.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

Implementation of Alternative 1 would not alter the scenic vista of EMJ Park at all, as it would remain in its current state. No new or additional facilities would be constructed, and therefore, the scenic resources and pastoral feel of the existing park would remain intact. Additionally, no new sources of light and glare would be constructed. Therefore, when compared to the proposed Project, new light impacts associated with Alternative 1 would be less.

Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in significant aesthetics impacts. All potential impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.

Air Quality

The Project site currently consists of a 104-acre park. EMJ Park is currently considered a passive park, with walking amenities, fitness amenities, fishing and water amenities, and a small children's play area. Implementation of Alternative 1 would not increase air quality impacts over current conditions. No additional traffic is anticipated to occur over current conditions, and therefore, would not increase air quality impacts. Implementation of Alternative 1 would not generate increased automobile use or park use because no improvements would be implemented on the site. Additionally, because no construction would occur, no construction-related air quality emissions would be generated. Air quality impacts from Alternative 1 would be less than the proposed Project.

The proposed Project would not result in significant impacts associated with air quality. All impacts can be mitigated to a level of less than significant.

Biological Resources

The *Habitat Assessment* prepared for the Project site indicated that no sensitive species exist onsite, nor is there suitable habitat for any sensitive species. However, vegetation within the Project site has the potential to provide suitable nesting opportunities for avian species. No construction is proposed to occur with implementation of Alternative 1. Therefore, there is no potential to disrupt nesting opportunities for avian species.

Conversely, the proposed Project would include the construction of a variety of amenities, of which could potentially disrupt nesting opportunities should construction occur during breeding season. As identified in Section 4.3 of this EIR, the implementation of mitigation measures would ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, when compared to the proposed Project, implementation of Alternative 1 would result in fewer impacts when compared to the proposed Project.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 1 would not include the development of any new amenities or facilities. No ground disturbance would occur, and therefore, no adverse changes would occur to any potential cultural resources.

A *Cultural Resources Assessment* was conducted by BCR Consulting and was completed pursuant to CEQA for the Project site. The records search and field survey did not identify any known cultural resources within the Project site. Because no historical, paleontological, or archaeological resources exist on the Project site, less than significant impacts would occur and no additional cultural resources work or monitoring would be necessary.

Both Alternative 1 and the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

As previously stated, both Alternative 1 and the proposed Project would be located within the same Project footprint. Less numbers of people and structures could potentially be exposed to geologic hazards under Alternative 1 as compared to the proposed Project scenarios. No significant geologic hazards are anticipated to occur. Although implementation of the proposed Project would be mitigated to a level of less than significant Alternative 1 would have less people and structures on site and therefore less potential for exposure to geologic hazards.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

No construction would occur with the implementation of Alternative 1, and therefore, no construction-related greenhouse gas emissions would be generated. Implementation of Alternative 1 would not generate increased automobile use or park use because no improvements would be implemented on the Project site. Therefore, no operational greenhouse gas emissions would occur over existing conditions, which is less than the proposed Project.

The proposed Project would not result in significant impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions. All impacts can be mitigated to a level of less than significant.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative 1 would not include the development of additional facilities, and the Project site would continue to operate as a recreational park. No hazards or hazardous materials impacts are anticipated to occur with implementation of Alternative 1.

The proposed Project includes the relocation of the SAH to the area along the eastern edge of EMJ Park, adjacent to the sports complex. Ongoing operational activities would include transportation and storage of potentially hazardous materials at the SAH. All applicable regulations and safety standards related to the storage and application of potentially hazardous materials would be followed.

The configuration of the existing north lake would be enhanced while the existing south lake would be repurposed into a usable living water feature. The lake and some of the water features may need to be treated periodically with chemicals to maintain water quality. However, it is anticipated that chemical maintenance for these amenities, such as adding chlorine, would not utilize large quantities such that if spilled would result in harmful exposure to the public.

If an aquatic center is developed, it would involve the use of chemicals, such as chlorine, to maintain the pool(s). However, it is anticipated that chemical maintenance for these amenities, such as adding chlorine, would not utilize large quantities such that if spilled would result in harmful exposure to the public.

The County does not propose to develop amenities on any portions of the Project site that have previously contained contaminated soils until the remediation actions have been completed and both the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) and the State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) have deemed each particular use area to have been remediated below the thresholds

appropriate for public use of the site. With the implementation of mitigation measures, less than significant impacts would occur. Alternative 1 and the proposed Project have equivalent potential impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials.

Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality

Alternative 1 would not include the development of additional facilities, and the Project site would continue to operate as a recreational park. No potential hydrology and/or water quality issues would occur. All hydrology impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project would be considered less than significant. Alternative 1 does not include dewatering of the lakes and removal of the island that is used heavily by birds, which would result in an improved water quality of the lake.

Land Use

Alternative 1 would not include the development of additional facilities, and the Project site would continue to operate as a recreational park. No potential land use inconsistencies would occur, as no land use changes would occur.

The existing EMJ Park and the former UVA site are zoned "Open Space" according to the General Plan and the County Department of Regional Planning. The adjacent area that would potentially be incorporated into EMJ Park, the UHC site, is currently "Low Density Residential". The County is currently in the process of updating its General Plan, which is anticipated to designate the former UVA site as "Open Space", while the UHC site remains designated as "Low Density Residential" because it is privately owned. However, should the County at some point acquire that site, a general plan amendment would be adopted that would ensure it would be changed to "Open Space", and would therefore, be compatible with the rest of EMJ Park. As a result, this Project would not conflict with an applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations. Therefore, impacts regarding land use would be less than significant.

Noise

No construction would occur with the implementation of Alternative 1. Therefore, no construction-related noise would be generated. Implementation of Alternative 1 would

not generate increased automobile use or park use because no improvements would be implemented on the site. Therefore, no operational noise impacts would occur over existing conditions.

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to noise when mitigation is implemented. However, the proposed Project would result in significant vibration impacts from construction equipment to residences along the northern boundary and schools along the southwest boundary of EMJ Park. This impact would be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, when compared to the proposed Project, Alternative 1 would result in reduced noise and vibration impacts.

Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems

Under Alternative 1, no increased impacts on public services or utilities would occur, as the Project site would remain in its existing state. No additional amenities would be developed as part of Alternative 1, and therefore, increased public service or utility demands would not occur.

As described in Section 4.11, *Public Services and Utilities*, of this EIR, the proposed Project is anticipated to generate an increased demand for public services and utilities when compared to existing conditions. However, the County has the capacity to handle the increase in demands for services and utilities, and therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.

Recreation

No additional recreational amenities would occur with implementation of Alternative 1, and EMJ Park would remain in its current state. Additionally, no amenities would be developed on the former UVA site or the UHC site. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in greater impacts to recreation as the full potential of recreational amenities is not achieved as compared to the proposed Project.

The implementation of additional recreation facilities proposed for the Project site, detailed in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of this EIR, and mentioned above, may have

an adverse effect on the environment at the Project site or its vicinity. The impacts associated with the proposed improvements are described throughout this EIR. As stated previously, the only significant and unavoidable impacts that would occur with implementation of the proposed Project are from vibration from temporary construction activities close to residences and schools.

The proposed Project includes retention and improvement of the existing passive amenities of the park as well as construction of an extensive number of amenities that is anticipated to greatly increase the use of EMJ Park on a local and regional level. As Alternative 1 would not maximize the diverse recreational opportunities of the site for the community, when compared to the proposed Project, Alternative 1 would have greater impacts when compared to the proposed Project related to recreation. If the park is left as is it is not providing the full potential of different types of recreational uses for the surrounding community that could occur at this site.

Transportation and Traffic

A moderate amount of traffic is currently generated by EMJ Park. It is heavily used during certain times of the day and on weekends. Implementation of Alternative 1 would not include the development of additional amenities and therefore, no additional traffic would be generated. No additional parking would occur under Alternative 1.

While the proposed Project would increase the intensity and usage of the Project site, and therefore would increase traffic to and from the site, traffic impacts are considered to be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Minor traffic impacts are anticipated to occur during construction of the Project. However, with implementation of a Traffic Management Plan, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Alternative 1, the "No Project" Alternative, would not meet any of the Project objectives, with the exception of adequate traffic access and parking facilities (as there is adequate access and parking for the existing uses). The "No Project" Alternative would

continue to provide recreational amenities to the local and regional residents. However, Alternative 1 would not include the development of a Master Plan for the site, and therefore, would not include the future development of increased park use opportunities and amenities.

8.4 ALTERNATIVE 2: ALTERNATIVE SOUTH AGENCY HEADQUARTERS LOCATION ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The intent of the Alternative SAH Location Alternative (Alternative 2) is to evaluate different land use and access configurations by changing the location of the SAH identified in the proposed Master Plan; refer to Exhibit 8-1, *Alternative South Agency Headquarters Location*. Alternative 2 considers the possible development phasing option of constructing the SAH on the southeast corner of the Project site, at the corner of El Segundo Boulevard and Clovis Boulevard. The proposed multi-purpose soccer & football fields would be relocated to the former UVA site. The western portion of the EMJ Park site is not constrained by remediation work required by the Remediation Action Plan (RAP). Therefore, as discussed in the development phasing section of the Project Description, the western portion is more likely to be available in the early phases of park development. Alternative 2 provides an analysis of the potential impacts associated with placing the SAH on the southeast corner of the Project site.

It is anticipated that development of the proposed Project components would occur in approximately six phases as shown in Exhibit 3.0-8, *CEQA Conceptual Development Plan*, with ultimate buildout of the Project site anticipated to occur by 2030. The phases include six smaller areas of the site that could be developed independently from a site design perspective (i.e. functional grading phases and construction logistics) as remediation phases are completed and funding for construction of amenities becomes available. The first phase, Phase I is generally located in the center of the site and has a low level of remediation constraints and provides a wide range of recreational activities and from a design and planning perspective is a logical first phase. The remaining five areas of the site could be developed in a variety of different sequences that is yet to be determined.

The majority of the Project area consists of the existing EMJ Park and is “Open Space” (O-S) under *General Plan* Land Use Designation. The remainder of the Project area includes the former UVA site and the UHC site, which is designated “Low Density Residential”.

The County is currently in the process of updating its General Plan, which if adopted as currently proposed will directly address this inconsistent designation and intended use. It is anticipated that the Los Angeles County *General Plan 2035* will designate the former UVA site as Open Space, while the UHC site’s designation will remain unchanged.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

Both Alternative 2 and the proposed Project include the development of the same facilities. Therefore, both the proposed Project and Alternative 2 would increase the intensity of development of the site, which would change the aesthetics of the site. Additionally, the increased amenities would include additional security lighting, facility lighting, and light and glare associated with an increase in vehicular traffic. The additional light generated by the new facilities would increase ambient nighttime lighting within the project site. All lighting would be required to adhere to County lighting ordinances to direct light downward. The same mitigation would be applied to Alternative 1 as the proposed Project. With mitigation measures identified in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics, Light, and Glare*, of this EIR, impacts would be less than significant. When compared to the proposed Project Alternative 2 would have equivalent impacts related to aesthetics and lighting.

Air Quality

Both Alternative 2 and the proposed Project include the development of the same facilities. Therefore, both the proposed Project and Alternative 2 would increase the intensity of development of the site, which would increase potential air quality impacts. However, as identified in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, of this EIR, impacts would be reduced

to a level of less than significant. The relocation of the SAH as proposed in Alternative 2 is not anticipated to significantly change the outcome of potential air quality impacts.

Biological Resources

As previously stated, both Alternative 2 and the proposed Project would include the development of the same amenities within the same Project footprint. Under both scenarios, impacts associated with biological resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

Cultural Resources

As previously stated, both Alternative 2 and the proposed Project would include the development of the same amenities within the same Project footprint. Under both scenarios, impacts associated with cultural resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

As previously stated, both Alternative 2 and the proposed Project would include the development of the same amenities within the same Project footprint. Under both scenarios, impacts associated with geology, soils, and seismicity would be less than significant with mitigation.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Both Alternative 2 and the proposed Project include the development of the same facilities. Therefore, both the proposed Project and Alternative 2 would increase the intensity of development of the site, which would increase potential greenhouse gas emissions. However, as identified in Section 4.6, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change*, of this EIR, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant. The relocation of the SAH as proposed in Alternative 2 is not anticipated to significantly change the outcome of potential greenhouse gas impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As previously stated, both Alternative 2 and the proposed Project would include the development of the same amenities within the same Project footprint. The proposed Project includes the relocation of the SAH to the area along the eastern edge of EMJ Park, adjacent to the sports complex. Ongoing operation activities would include transportation and storage of potentially hazardous materials at the SAH. All applicable regulations and safety standards related to the storage and application of materials would be followed.

The configuration of the existing north lake would be enhanced while the existing south lake would be repurposed with more recreational opportunities. The lake and some of the water features may need to be treated periodically with chemicals to maintain water quality. However, it is anticipated that chemical maintenance for these amenities, such as adding chlorine, would not utilize large quantities such that if spilled would result in harmful exposure to the public.

If an aquatic center is developed, it would involve the use of chemicals, such as chlorine, to maintain the pool(s). However, it is anticipated that chemical maintenance for these amenities, such as adding chlorine, would not utilize large quantities such that if spilled would result in harmful exposure to the public.

The County does not propose to develop amenities on any portions of the site that have previously contained contaminated soils until the remediation actions have been completed and both the LARWQCB and the DTSC have deemed each particular use area to have been remediated below the thresholds appropriate for public use of the site. With the implementation of mitigation measures, less than significant impacts would occur.

Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality

As previously stated, both Alternative 2 and the proposed Project would include the development of the same amenities within the same Project footprint. As identified in

Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of this EIR, less than significant impacts would occur with respect to hydrology, drainage, and water quality.

The Project would include removing the existing two lakes and replacing them with a new single lake in the approximate same location of the current northeastern lake. The existing lakes would need to be drained prior to the implementation of the new lake and splash pad area. A Dewatering Permit would need to be obtained from the LARWQCB for dewatering of the lakes. With compliance with all dewatering permit conditions and treatment of the lake water to appropriate water quality standards prior to discharge, lake dewatering would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirement. Alternative 2 would result in improved water quality of the lake as compared to the proposed Project.

Land Use

As previously stated, both Alternative 2 and the proposed Project would include the development of the same amenities but at different locations within the Project site. The majority of the Project area consists of the existing EMJ Park and is “Open Space” (O-S) under *General Plan* Land Use Designation. The remainder of the Project area includes the former UVA site and the UHC site, which is designated “Low Density Residential”.

The County is currently in the process of adopting a General Plan (Los Angeles County *General Plan 2035*), which will directly address this incompatible zoning. It is anticipated that the Los Angeles County *General Plan 2035* will designate the former UVA site as Open Space, while the UHC site’s designation will remain unchanged. However, should the County at some point acquire that site, a General Plan Amendment would be adopted that would ensure the land use designation and consequently would be changed to Open Space and therefore be consistent with the rest of EMJ Park.

Under both scenarios, impacts associated with land use would be less than significant.

Noise

Both Alternative 2 and the proposed Project include the development of the same facilities. Therefore, both the proposed Project and Alternative 2 would increase the intensity of development of the site, which would increase potential noise-related impacts. As identified in Section 4.10, *Noise*, of this EIR, less than significant noise impacts would occur with the implementation of mitigation measures however, impacts due to vibration from construction equipment near residences along the northern site boundary and schools along the southwest site boundary would be significant and unavoidable. The relocation of the SAH as proposed in Alternative 2 is not anticipated to significantly change the outcome of potential noise impacts. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in equivalent noise impacts as the proposed Project.

Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems

Under both the Alternative 2 and proposed Project scenarios, increased impacts to public services and utilities would occur, as both scenarios propose an increase in the intensity of uses at the Project site. However, the County has indicated that it has the resources needed to provide services and utilities to the site. The proposed Project and Alternative 2 would have a less than significant impact on all public services and utilities.

Recreation

Alternative 2 includes the same recreational opportunities and amenities as the proposed Project but in different locations. The impacts associated with the proposed improvements are described throughout this EIR. However, as previously stated, the proposed Project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, with the exception of vibration from large construction equipment used adjacent to residences and schools. Like the proposed Project Alternative 2 would optimize the recreational opportunities of the site for the community.

Transportation and Traffic

As previously discussed, both Alternative 2 and the proposed Project propose the same park amenities, however, in different locations. While the proposed Project and Alternative 2 would increase the intensity and usage of the Project site, and therefore would increase traffic to and from the site, traffic impacts are considered to be less than significant with mitigation. Minor traffic impacts are anticipated to occur during construction of Alternative 2 and the proposed Project. However, with implementation of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) during construction, as discussed in Section 4.13, *Transportation and Circulation*, of this EIR, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant under both scenarios.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Alternative 2 would meet all of the Project objectives previously identified above. Alternative 2 would include the development of a Master Plan that would include increased amenities at the Project site. Alternative 2 would have similar impacts to the proposed Project in all areas.

8.5 ALTERNATIVE 3: ALTERNATIVE EQUESTRIAN CENTER LOCATION ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The intent of the Alternative Equestrian Center Location Alternative (Alternative 3) is to evaluate different land use and access configurations by changing the location of the Equestrian Center identified in the proposed Master Plan; refer to Exhibit 8.0-2, *Alternative Equestrian Center Location*. Alternative 3 proposes to relocate the Equestrian Center to the southeast corner of EMJ Park. The proposed multi-purpose soccer & football fields would then be located on the west side of EMJ Park, along Avalon Boulevard. The western portion of the EMJ Park site is not constrained by remediation work required by the Remediation Action Plan (RAP). Therefore, as discussed in the development phasing section of the Project Description, the western portion of the site is more likely to be available in the early phases of park development. The Alternative 3 evaluates the option of programming the Equestrian Center for construction at a later phase of park development. In this case the multi-purpose soccer & football fields

which is one of the active recreational facilities, is alternatively located on the west side of the EMJ Park.

It is anticipated that development of the proposed Project components would occur in approximately six phases as shown in Exhibit 3.0-8, *CEQA Conceptual Development Plan*, with ultimate buildout of the Project site anticipated to occur by 2030. The phases include six smaller areas of the site that could be developed independently from a site design perspective (i.e. functional grading phases and construction logistics) as remediation phases are completed and funding for construction of amenities becomes available. The first phase, Phase I is generally located in the center of the site and has a low level of remediation constraints and provides a wide range of recreational activities and from a design and planning perspective is a logical first phase. The remaining five areas of the site could be developed in a variety of different sequences that is yet to be determined.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

Both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project include the development of the same facilities. Therefore, both the proposed Project and Alternative 3 would increase the intensity of development of the site, which would change the aesthetics of the site. Additionally, the increased amenities would include additional security lighting, facility lighting, and light associated with an increase in vehicular traffic. The additional light and glare generated by the new facilities would increase the ambient nighttime light in the project site. All lighting would be required to adhere to County lighting ordinances to direct light downward. The same mitigation would be applied to Alternative 3 as the proposed Project. With mitigation measures identified in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics, Light, and Glare*, of this EIR, impacts would be less than significant.

Air Quality

Both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project include the development of the same facilities. Therefore, both the proposed Project and Alternative 3 would increase the

intensity of development of the site, which would increase potential air quality impacts. However, as identified in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, of this EIR, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant. The relocation of the Equestrian Center as proposed in Alternative 3 is not anticipated to significantly change the outcome of potential air quality impacts.

Biological Resources

As previously stated, both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project would include the development of the same amenities within the same Project footprint. Under both scenarios, impacts associated with biological resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

Cultural Resources

As previously stated, both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project would include the development of the same amenities within the same Project footprint. Under both scenarios, impacts associated with cultural resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

As previously stated, both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project would include the development of the same amenities within the same Project footprint. Under both scenarios, impacts associated with geology, soils, and seismicity would be less than significant with mitigation.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project include the development of the same facilities. Therefore, both the proposed Project and Alternative 3 would increase the intensity of development of the site, which would increase potential greenhouse gas emissions. However, as identified in Section 4.6, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change*, of this EIR, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant. The relocation of the Equestrian Center as proposed in Alternative 3 is not anticipated to significantly change the outcome of potential greenhouse gas impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As previously stated, both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project would include the development of the same amenities within the same Project footprint. The proposed Project includes the relocation of the Equestrian Center to the southeastern corner of EMJ Park. Ongoing operation activities would include transportation and storage of potentially hazardous materials at the Equestrian Center. All applicable regulations and safety standards related to the storage and application of materials would be followed.

The configuration of the existing north lake would be enhanced while the existing south lake would be repurposed into a usable living water feature. The lake and some of the water features may need to be treated periodically with chemicals to maintain water quality. However, it is anticipated that chemical maintenance for these amenities, such as adding chlorine, would not utilize large quantities such that if spilled would result in harmful exposure to the public.

If an aquatic center is developed, it would involve the use of chemicals, such as chlorine, to maintain the pool(s). However, it is anticipated that chemical maintenance for these amenities, such as adding chlorine, would not utilize large quantities such that if spilled would result in harmful exposure to the public.

The County does not propose to develop amenities on any portions of the site that have previously contained contaminated soils until the remediation actions have been completed and both the LARWQCB and the DTSC have deemed each particular use area to have been remediated below the thresholds appropriate for public use of the site. With the implementation of mitigation measures, less than significant impacts would occur.

Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality

As previously stated, both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project would include the development of the same amenities within the same Project footprint. As identified in Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of this EIR, less than significant impacts would occur with respect to hydrology, drainage, and water quality.

The Project would include removing the existing two lakes and replacing them with a new single lake in the approximate same location of the current northeastern lake. The existing lakes would need to be drained prior to the implementation of the new lake and splash pad area. A Dewatering Permit would need to be obtained from the LARWQCB for dewatering of the lakes. With compliance with all dewatering permit conditions and treatment of the lake water to appropriate water quality standards prior to discharge, lake dewatering would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirement. Alternative 3 would result in improved water quality of the lake as compared to the proposed Project.

Land Use

As previously stated, both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project would include the development of the same amenities but in different locations within the Project site. The majority of the Project area consists of the existing EMJ Park and is "Open Space" (O-S) under General Plan Land Use Designation. The remainder of the Project area includes the former UVA site and the UHC site, which is designated "Low Density Residential".

The County is currently in the process of adopting the *General Plan 2035*. It is anticipated that the *General Plan 2035* will designate the former UVA site as Open Space, while the UHC site's designation will remain unchanged. However, should the County at some point acquire that site, a General Plan Amendment would be adopted that would ensure the land use designation and consequently would be changed to Open Space and therefore be consistent with the rest of EMJ Park.

Under both scenarios, impacts associated with land use would be less than significant.

Noise

Both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project include the development of the same facilities. Therefore, both the proposed Project and Alternative 2 would increase the intensity of development of the site, which would increase potential noise-related impacts. As identified in Section 4.10, *Noise*, of this EIR, less than significant noise impacts would with the implementation of mitigation measures would occur however,

impacts due to vibration from construction equipment near residences along the northern site boundary and schools along the southwest site boundary would be significant and unavoidable. The relocation of the SAH as proposed in Alternative 3 is not anticipated to significantly change the outcome of potential noise impacts. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in equivalent noise impacts with the proposed Project.

Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems

Under both the Alternative 3 and proposed Project scenarios, increased impacts to public services and utilities would occur, as both scenarios propose an increase in the intensity of uses at the Project site. However, the County has indicated that it has the resources needed to provide services and utilities to the site. The proposed Project and Alternative 3 would have a less than significant impact on all public services and utilities.

Recreation

Alternative 3 includes the same recreational opportunities and amenities as the proposed Project but in different locations. However, as previously stated, the proposed Project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, with the exception of vibration from large construction equipment used adjacent to residences and schools. Like the proposed Project Alternative 3 would optimize the recreational opportunities of the site for the community.

Transportation and Traffic

As previously discussed, both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project propose the same park amenities, however, in different locations. Minor traffic impacts are anticipated to occur during construction of Alternative 3 and the proposed Project. However, with implementation of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) during construction, as discussed in Section 4.13, *Transportation and Circulation*, of this EIR, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant under both scenarios. Alternative 3 proposes to relocate the Equestrian Center to the southeast corner of EMJ Park. The proposed multi-purpose soccer & football fields would then be located on the west side of EMJ Park, along

Avalon Boulevard. Clover Avenue would be used to access the Equestrian Center and the SAH. Clovis Avenue is a narrower road than Avalon Blvd and does not provide through access to East 120th St. Therefore, all trips to the Equestrian Center and the SAH would need to go through the El Segundo Blvd/ Clover Ave intersection, which is already a busy intersection. It is anticipated that traffic coming to and from the Equestrian Center for events may result in vehicles with horse trailers and queuing issues at the intersection of El Segundo Blvd and Clovis Ave. As Avalon Blvd is a wider street and the entrance to the Equestrian Center for Alternative 3 and the proposed Project are not anticipated to have this issue.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES











Alternative 3 would meet all of the Project objectives previously identified above. Alternative 3 would include the development of a Master Plan that would include increased amenities at the Project site. Alternative 3 would have similar impacts to the proposed Project in all areas with the exception of traffic and a more restricted access off of Clover Ave as compared to Avalon Ave in the proposed Project and Alternative 2.

8.6 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Guidelines requires that an Environmentally Superior Alternative be identified; that is, an alternative that would result in the fewest or least significant environmental impacts. If the "No Project" Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (e)(2) requires that another alternative that could feasibly attain most of the basic Project's basic objectives be chosen as the environmentally superior alternative.

With implementation of the mitigation measures all impacts from Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would be reduced to less than significant levels, with the exception of vibration from temporary construction activities adjacent to residential and institutional uses, consistent with the proposed Project. Potential impacts associated with Alternative 2 are generally equivalent to impacts from the proposed Project. Potential impacts associated with Alternative 3 are greater than the proposed Project and Alternative 2 due to the access location and potential queueing issues for Equestrian Center events. Therefore, Alternatives 2 and 3 are neither environmentally superior nor

inferior to the proposed Project. Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, has less environmental impacts related to all topics with the exception of hydrology and recreation as there would be no construction or increase in use of EMJ Park. Alternative 1 has greater impacts related to hydrology and recreation as improvements to water quality and greater opportunities for recreation locally and regionally would not be completed. Alternative 1 does not meet the majority of the project objectives.

-  Picnic
-  Restrooms
-  Play Area
-  Information Kiosk
-  Pedestrian Path
-  Equestrian Path
-  Skate Park
-  Exercise Station
-  Fishing
-  Kayaks & Paddle Boats



EARVIN "MAGIC" JOHNSON PARK MASTER PLAN DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT Alternative 2: South Agency Headquarters Location











Michael Baker
INTERNATIONAL



Source: AHBE Landscape Architects

This page intentionally left blank.

-  Picnic
-  Restrooms
-  Play Area
-  Information Kiosk/ Sheriff Station
-  Pedestrian Path
-  Equestrian Path
-  Skate Park
-  Exercise Station



Michael Baker
INTERNATIONAL



Source: AHBE Landscape Architects

EARVIN "MAGIC" JOHNSON PARK MASTER PLAN DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT Alternative 3: Equestrian Center Location

This page intentionally left blank.