

Chapter 4

Comparison of Alternatives

4.1 Introduction

Section 15126.6(a) 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.” In addition, Section 15126.6(e) requires that an EIR evaluate a “no project” alternative. These alternatives are discussed in the sections below.

4.2 CEQA Alternatives

As stated in Chapter 2, the objectives of the proposed Project are to:

- Serve the open space and recreational needs of surrounding communities;
- Connect and improve neighborhoods;
- Incorporate sustainable design consistent with the City’s plans and goals;
- Encourage active modes of transportation and public transit;
- Promote beneficial stormwater treatment and/or capture; and
- Provide safe pedestrian and bicycle access to the River.

With implementation of mitigation measures described in Sections 3.1 through 3.16, the proposed Project would not result in significant and unavoidable impacts. Although no significant and unavoidable impacts were identified, the following alternatives to the proposed Project have been evaluated in accordance with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines:

- No Project Alternative
- Alternative 1 – Nature Focused Alternative
- Alternative 2 – Sports Focused Alternative

These alternatives are described below.

4.2.1 No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the area of the proposed 13-acre Project Site would remain as vacant land and an industrial and freight corridor. The land is comprised of a combination of City, State, and Caltrans right-of-way, which could potentially be used as a storage area. Under the No Project Alternative, no public park amenities would be constructed and no landscaping, lighting, or pedestrian improvements would be made. No improvements to the LA River channel, including terracing and landscaping, would be made.

4.2.2 Alternative 1 – Nature Focused Alternative

Alternative 1 – Nature Focused Alternative is similar to the proposed Project. Under this alternative, the Project Site would be located in the same area as under the proposed Project. Alternative 1 would also include the following elements:

West Park/Arts Plaza

Under Alternative 1, the West Park/Arts Plaza would include the same features and programming as the proposed Project.

East Park

Alternative 1 would feature less programming than the proposed Project, and would include the following elements and activities:

- Approximately 2,000-square-foot building with concessions and public restrooms;
- Two synthetic turf soccer field with field lighting;
- Two flexible play and performance lawns with combined capacity to hold events up to approximately 2,800 people;
- Salvaged bridge light poles and salvaged arch as barrier/seat wall;
- Nature walk and meadow and treed areas;
- Children’s nature-play area and splash pad;
- Designated picnic and grilling areas;
- Landscaped seating areas and rain gardens;
- Small dog and large dog play areas; and
- Parking plaza with 14 spaces on-site.

LA River Park Elements

Under Alternative 1, the LA River park elements would include the same features and programming as the proposed Project.

General Park Elements

Under Alternative 1, the general park elements would include the same features and programming as the proposed Project.

4.2.3 Alternative 2 – Sports Focused Alternative

Alternative 2 – Sports Focused Alternative is similar to the proposed Project. Under this alternative, the park would be located in the same area as the proposed Project. Alternative 2 would also include the following elements:

West Park/Arts Plaza

Under Alternative 2, the West Park/Arts Plaza would include the same features and programming as the proposed Project.

East Park

Alternative 2 would feature more programming than the proposed Project, and would include the following elements and activities:

- Approximately 2,000-square-foot building with concessions and public restrooms;
- Two synthetic turf soccer fields with field lighting;
- Two adult-sized flexible sports courts for basketball, futsal, and volleyball with combined capacity to hold events up to approximately 700 people;
- Two flexible play and performance lawns with combined capacity to hold events up to approximately 2,800 people;
- Skate plaza;
- Salvaged bridge light poles and salvaged arch as barrier/seat wall;
- Nature walk and meadow and treed areas;
- Children’s nature-play area and splash pad;
- Designated picnic and grilling areas;
- Landscaped seating areas and rain gardens;
- Small dog and large dog play areas; and
- Parking plaza with 14 spaces on-site.

LA River Park Elements

Under Alternative 2, the LA River park elements would include the same features and programming as the proposed Project.

General Park Elements

Under Alternative 2, the general park elements would include the same features and programming as the proposed Project.

4.3 Alternatives Considered but Rejected as Infeasible

Section 15126.6(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR “identify any alternatives that were considered by the Lead Agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process,” as well as explain the reasons for the Lead Agency’s determination. An alternative may be eliminated from consideration if it (1) fails to meet most of the project’s basic objectives, (2) is infeasible, or (3) is unable to avoid significant environmental impacts.

There are no alternatives that the City can identify that would avoid significant environmental impacts and meet the project's basic objectives. The following alternative was considered and eliminated from further evaluation:

Alternative Project Site. The City already owns the Project Site and cannot reasonably be expected to acquire, control, or access an alternative site that would meet the project's basic objectives in a timely fashion. It is anticipated that significant and unavoidable impacts associated with noise, traffic, water quality, and land use could occur if an Alternative Project Site could be found in Downtown LA, along the LA River. As such, development of the proposed Project at an alternative site could potentially produce other environmental impacts that would otherwise not occur at the current Project Site and result in greater environmental impacts than the proposed Project. Therefore, an alternative site is not considered feasible since the City does not own another suitable site that would achieve the underlying purpose and objectives of the proposed Project.

4.4 Evaluation of CEQA Alternatives

The impacts of each of the alternatives are briefly described below and are compared to the objectives of the proposed Project. The analysis includes a discussion of a No Project Alternative as required under Section 15126(e)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines so that decision-makers can compare the impacts of approving the proposed Project with the impacts of not approving the proposed Project. The proposed Project meets all of the objectives described in Section 4.2, Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 meet some of the objectives, and the No Project Alternative does not meet any of the objectives. Alternatives 1 and 2 would be required to comply with the same mitigation measures that would be implemented for the proposed Project for all environmental resources with a "Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation" determination.

4.4.1 No Project Alternative

Because the area of the proposed 13-acre Project Site would remain as vacant land and an industrial and freight corridor, the objectives of the proposed Project described in Section 4.2 would not be met. Although the No Project Alternative would not result in significant environmental impacts, it would also not include the following benefits that would occur with implementation of the proposed Project, Alternative 1, or Alternative 2:

- **Aesthetics:** The No Project Alternative would not result in the visual character and quality improvements under the proposed Project, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2, which include landscaping, vegetation, recreational areas, and public art.
- **Air Quality:** With the exception of emissions generated from vehicle traffic during large events, the existing industrial land use associated with the No Project Alternative would contribute greater operational emissions than the land uses associated with the proposed Project, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (i.e., smaller special events, soccer fields, park uses, and buildings).
- **Energy:** The existing industrial land use associated with the No Project Alternative would require greater energy consumption than the land uses associated with the proposed Project, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2.

- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** With the exception of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions generated from vehicle traffic during infrequent large events (up to 5,000 people), the existing industrial land use associated with the No Project Alternative would contribute greater GHG emissions than the land uses associated with the proposed Project, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 (i.e., smaller special events, soccer fields, park uses, and buildings).
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** Under the No Project Alternative, contaminated soils would be left in place and would not be remediated to standards acceptable by the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD) and other regulatory agencies as required.
- **Recreation:** Under the No Project Alternative, there would continue to be a high need for parks in the communities of Boyle Heights and Central City North. The proposed Project, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 would provide additional park and recreation services that may alleviate the demand for other existing parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Project Area.
- **Noise and Vibration:** Under the No Project Alternative, the existing industrial land use would continue to generate noise at levels greater than that projected for the proposed Project (i.e., special events, soccer fields, park uses, and buildings).
- **Traffic and Transportation:** Under the No Project Alternative, improvements to pedestrian and bicycle access throughout the Project Area would not occur.

4.4.2 Alternative 1 – Nature Focused Alternative

Alternative 1 would meet the objectives of the proposed Project described in Section 4.2. However, Alternative 1 would provide reduced programming compared to the proposed Project. As such, the public indicated greater support for the proposed Project because it would provide a better balance of the open space and recreational needs for the surrounding communities than Alternative 1.

Impacts during construction would be similar to the proposed Project. During operation, Alternative 1 would feature smaller event capacity and reduced recreational programming, which would result in less project-generated vehicle traffic to the Project Site. The impacts for each environmental resource are discussed below.

4.4.2.1 Aesthetics

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Compared to the proposed Project, the East Park would feature more vegetation and landscaping under Alternative 1, which would marginally change the visual character and quality of the Project Site.

4.4.2.2 Air Quality

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Under Alternative 1, event capacity for large events in the proposed East Park would be reduced to 2,800 people, compared to 3,300 people under the proposed Project. In addition, the East Park would feature fewer sports fields under Alternative 1 than under the proposed Project. Because Alternative 1 features less recreational programming than the proposed Project, it is anticipated that Alternative 1 would result in less operational emissions of criteria air pollutants (i.e., reactive organic gas, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, sulfur oxide, and particulate matter) than the proposed Project.

4.4.2.3 Biological Resources

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, best management practices (BMP) would be implemented to avoid and minimize construction impacts (i.e., habitat removal; increased noise, vibration, light, carbon dioxide, and human activity; and construction staging and activities in the LA River channel) on special-status species and aquatic resources. Compared to the proposed Project, the East Park would feature more vegetation and landscaping under Alternative 1, which could potentially create additional nesting habitat for special-status birds during operations.

4.4.2.4 Cultural Resources

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, standard measures would be implemented in the case of an unanticipated discovery of cultural resources during construction of Alternative 1. As with the proposed Project, operation of Alternative 1 would not involve any ground-disturbing activities; therefore, there would be no potential to disturb, damage, or degrade cultural resources.

4.4.2.5 Energy

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Under the proposed Project and Alternative 1, energy consumption would be required for park lighting, WiFi, security cameras, on-site buildings, electric vehicle charging station, and sound and lighting equipment for special events. In addition, diesel and gasoline fuel would be consumed from on-road vehicles. Under Alternative 1, smaller event capacity and reduced recreational programming would reduce energy consumption, when compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, energy consumption would be marginally less under Alternative 1.

4.4.2.6 Geology and Soils

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, BMPs would be implemented to reduce the potential for erosion during soil excavation and other construction activities. In addition, Alternative 1 would follow standard engineering practices and recommendations identified in the *Geotechnical Site Investigation* (Hushmand Associates, Inc., 2018) to reduce the potential for geologic hazards. Similar to the proposed Project, open spaces would be landscaped or hardscaped such that soil erosion and the loss of topsoil are not anticipated during operation of Alternative 1.

4.4.2.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Under the proposed Project and Alternative 1, the majority of GHG emissions would be associated with motor vehicle use. Under Alternative 1, smaller event capacity and reduced recreational programming would reduce motor vehicle use to the Project Site, when compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, GHG emissions would be marginally less under Alternative 1.

4.4.2.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, Alternative 1 would result in remediation of the Project Site to standards acceptable by LACoFD and other regulatory agencies as required. Under these standards, the concentrations of contaminants of concern would not pose health

risks to construction workers or the public. The use of hazardous materials during construction or during routine maintenance and landscaping would be subject to proper handling and disposal in compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

4.4.2.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, Alternative 1 would result in the net addition of impervious surfaces. However, this minor increase would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies, interfere with groundwater recharge, or increase the potential for flooding. Alternative 1 would include construction and low impact development (LID) BMPs to prevent, control, and reduce the potential for stormwater pollutants to degrade ground or surface water quality.

4.4.2.10 Land Use and Planning

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, Alternative 1 is consistent with the City's General Plan land use and zoning designations. The City Bureau of Engineering would continue to work with the Los Angeles Department of City Planning to ensure that Alternative 1 is consistent with future zoning changes.

4.4.2.11 Noise and Vibration

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Under the proposed Project and Alternative 1, operational noise levels would be associated with project-generated vehicle traffic and onsite recreational uses and events. Alternative 1 features smaller event capacity and reduced recreational programming than the proposed Project. Therefore, operational noise levels would be marginally less under Alternative 1 compared to the proposed Project.

4.4.2.12 Population and Housing

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, Alternative 1 would not have the potential to result in growth that would otherwise not occur.

4.4.2.13 Public Services

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, Alternative 1 could increase the demand for fire and police protection services; however, the expansion or construction of new fire or police protection facilities would not be required. Alternative 1 would provide additional recreation and park services that may alleviate the demand for other existing parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Project Area.

4.4.2.14 Recreation

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, Alternative 1 would provide additional recreation and park services that may alleviate the demand for other existing parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Project Area.

4.4.2.15 Transportation and Traffic

Impacts from proposed construction activities would be similar to the proposed Project. Under Alternative 1, event capacity for large events in the proposed East Park would be reduced to 2,800 people, compared to 3,300 people under the proposed Project. In addition, the East Park would feature fewer sports fields under Alternative 1 than under the proposed Project. Because Alternative 1 features smaller event capacity and reduced recreational programming than the proposed Project, project-generated vehicle traffic would be marginally less under Alternative 1. In addition, the demand for parking under Alternative 1 during large events would be marginally reduced compared to the proposed Project.

4.4.2.16 Utilities and Service Systems

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, construction activities for Alternative 1 would be conducted in accordance with the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and all other applicable laws, policies, and regulations to avoid and minimize potential impacts. The water consumption and wastewater generation demands for operation of Alternative 1, like the proposed Project, would not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.

4.4.3 Alternative 2 – Sports Focused Alternative

Alternative 2 would meet the objectives of the proposed Project described in Section 4.2. However, Alternative 2 would provide increased programming compared to the proposed Project. As such, the public indicated greater support for the proposed Project because it would provide a better balance of the open space and recreational needs for the surrounding communities than Alternative 2.

Impacts during construction would be similar to the proposed Project. During operation, Alternative 2 would feature larger event capacity and increased recreational programming, which would result in more project-generated vehicle traffic to the Project Site. The impacts for each environmental resource are discussed below.

4.4.3.1 Aesthetics

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Compared to the proposed Project, the East Park would feature less vegetation and landscaping under Alternative 2, which would marginally change the visual character and quality of the Project Site.

4.4.3.2 Air Quality

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Under Alternative 2, event capacity for large events in the proposed East Park would be increased to 3,500 people, compared to 3,300 people under the proposed Project. In addition, the East Park would feature more sports fields under Alternative 2 than under the proposed Project. Because Alternative 2 features more recreational programming than the proposed Project, it is anticipated that Alternative 2 would result in greater operational emissions of criteria air pollutants (i.e., reactive organic gas, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, sulfur oxide, and particulate matter) than the proposed Project.

4.4.3.3 Biological Resources

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, BMPs would be implemented to avoid and minimize construction impacts (i.e., habitat removal; increased noise, vibration, light, carbon dioxide, and human activity; and construction staging and activities in the LA River channel) on special-status species and aquatic resources. Compared to the proposed Project, the East Park would feature less vegetation and landscaping under Alternative 2, which would create less nesting habitat for special-status birds during operations.

4.4.3.4 Cultural Resources

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, standard measures would be implemented in the case of an unanticipated discovery of cultural resources during construction of Alternative 2. As with the proposed Project, operation of Alternative 2 would not involve any ground-disturbing activities; therefore, there would be no potential to disturb, damage, or degrade cultural resources.

4.4.3.5 Energy

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, energy consumption would be required for park lighting, WiFi, security cameras, on-site buildings, electric vehicle charging station, and sound and lighting equipment for special events. In addition, diesel and gasoline fuel would be consumed from on-road vehicles. Under Alternative 2, larger event capacity and increased recreational programming would increase energy consumption, when compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, energy consumption would be marginally greater under Alternative 2.

4.4.3.6 Geology and Soils

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, BMPs would be implemented to reduce the potential for erosion during soil excavation and other construction activities. In addition, Alternative 2 would follow standard engineering practices and recommendations identified in the *Geotechnical Site Investigation* (Hushmand Associates, Inc., 2018) to reduce the potential for geologic hazards. Similar to the proposed Project, open spaces would be landscaped or hardscaped such that soil erosion and the loss of topsoil are not anticipated during operation of Alternative 2.

4.4.3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Under the proposed Project, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2, the majority of GHG emissions would be associated with motor vehicle use. Under Alternative 2, larger event capacity and increased recreational programming would increase motor vehicle use to the Project Site, when compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, GHG emissions would be marginally greater under Alternative 2.

4.4.3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would result in remediation of the Project Site to standards acceptable by LACoFD and other regulatory agencies as required. Under these standards, the concentrations of contaminants of concern would not pose health

risks to construction workers or the public. The use of hazardous materials during construction or during routine maintenance and landscaping would be subject to proper handling and disposal in compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

4.4.3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would result in the net addition of impervious surfaces. However, this minor increase would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies, interfere with groundwater recharge, or increase the potential for flooding. Alternative 1 would include construction and low impact development (LID) BMPs to prevent, control, and reduce the potential for stormwater pollutants to degrade ground or surface water quality.

4.4.3.10 Land Use and Planning

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, Alternative 2 is consistent with the City's General Plan land use and zoning designations. The City Bureau of Engineering would continue to work with the Los Angeles Department of City Planning to ensure that Alternative 2 is consistent with future zoning changes.

4.4.3.11 Noise and Vibration

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Under the proposed Project, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2, operational noise levels would be associated with project-generated vehicle traffic and onsite recreational uses and events. Alternative 2 features larger event capacity and increased recreational programming than the proposed Project. Therefore, operational noise levels would be marginally greater under Alternative 2 compared to the proposed Project.

4.4.3.12 Population and Housing

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would not have the potential to result in growth that would otherwise not occur.

4.4.3.13 Public Services

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, Alternative 2 could increase the demand for fire and police protection services; however, the expansion or construction of new fire or police protection facilities would not be required. Alternative 2 would provide additional recreation and park services that may alleviate the demand for other existing parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Project Area.

4.4.3.14 Recreation

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would provide additional recreation and park services that may alleviate the demand for other existing parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Project Area.

4.4.3.15 Transportation and Traffic

Impacts from proposed construction activities would be similar to the proposed Project. Under Alternative 2, event capacity for large events in the proposed East Park would be increased to 3,500 people, compared to 3,300 people under the proposed Project. In addition, the East Park would feature more sports fields under Alternative 2 than under the proposed Project. Because Alternative 2 features larger event capacity and increased recreational programming than the proposed Project, project-generated vehicle traffic would be marginally greater under Alternative 2. In addition, the demand for parking under Alternative 2 during large events would be marginally greater compared to the proposed Project.

4.4.3.16 Utilities and Service Systems

Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, construction activities for Alternative 2 would be conducted in accordance with the SWPPP and all other applicable laws, policies, and regulations to avoid and minimize potential impacts. The water consumption and wastewater generation demands for operation of Alternative 2, like the proposed Project, would not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.

4.5 Comparison of CEQA Alternatives

Table 4-1 compares the potential environmental impacts that would result from the proposed Project, No Project Alternative, Alternative 1 – Nature Focused Alternative, and Alternative 2 – Sports Focused Alternative. **Table 4-2** summarizes the environmental impacts of each alternative compared to the proposed Project. **Table 4-3** summarizes the impacts of each alternative compared to the existing condition and ranks each alternative based on these relative environmental impacts.

As noted in Section 4.4, the proposed Project, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 would have similar impacts. However, as shown in **Table 4-2**, impacts would be relatively reduced under Alternative 1 and relatively greater under Alternative 2, when compared to the proposed Project. As shown in **Table 4-3**, when compared to the existing condition, Alternative 1 would result in a slight increase in impacts, followed by the proposed Project. Alternative 2 would result in the greatest increase in impacts when compared to the existing condition.

Impacts under Alternative 1 would be marginally less than the proposed Project because of the reduced programming, smaller event sizes, and reduced project-generated vehicle traffic (see Section 4.4.2). Alternative 2 would result in the greatest impacts because of the increased programming, larger event sizes, and increased project-generated vehicle traffic (see Section 4.2.3).

The No Project Alternative would result in no impacts to the existing land use because it would not result in an action and would not require discretionary approvals that trigger CEQA compliance; however, it would not provide the benefits that would result from implementation of the proposed Project, Alternative 1, or Alternative 2 (see Section 4.4.1), nor would it meet the proposed Project objectives.

Table 4-1: Summary of CEQA Analysis by Alternative

Environmental Resource	No Project Alternative	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – Nature Focused Alternative	Alternative 2 – Sports Focused Alternative
Aesthetics				
Construction	No Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Air Quality				
Construction	No Impact.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact. Environmentally Superior.	Less than Significant Impact.
Biological Resources				
Construction	No Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Cultural Resources				
Construction	No Impact. Environmentally Superior.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Energy				
Construction	No Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact. Environmentally Superior.	Less than Significant Impact.
Geology and Soils				
Construction	No Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.

Environmental Resource	No Project Alternative	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – Nature Focused Alternative	Alternative 2 – Sports Focused Alternative
Operation	Environmentally Superior.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
Construction	No Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact. Environmentally Superior.	Less than Significant Impact.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
Construction	No Impact.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.
Hydrology and Water Quality				
Construction	No Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.
Land Use and Planning				
Construction	No Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Noise and Vibration				
Construction	No Impact.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact. Environmentally Superior.	Less than Significant Impact.

Environmental Resource	No Project Alternative	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – Nature Focused Alternative	Alternative 2 – Sports Focused Alternative
Population and Housing				
Construction	No Impact. Environmentally Superior.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Public Services				
Construction	No Impact. Environmentally Superior.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Recreation				
Construction	No Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Transportation and Traffic				
Construction	No Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. Environmentally Superior.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.
Utilities and Service Systems				
Construction	No Impact. Environmentally Superior.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.	Less than Significant Impact.
Operation		Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Table 4-2: Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project (Operational)

Environmental Resource	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – Nature Focused Alternative	Alternative 2 – Sports Focused Alternative
Aesthetics	0	0	0
Air Quality	0	-1	+1
Biological Resources	0	-1	+1
Cultural Resources	0	0	0
Energy	0	-1	+1
Geology and Soils	0	0	0
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	0	-1	+1
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	0	0	0
Hydrology and Water Quality	0	0	0
Land Use and Planning	0	0	0
Noise and Vibration	0	-1	+1
Population and Housing	0	0	0
Public Services	0	-1	+1
Recreation	0	0	0
Transportation/Traffic	0	-1	+1
Utilities and Service Systems	0	0	0
Total	0	-7	+7

Notes:

(-3) = Impacts considered to be substantially reduced when compared with the proposed Project.

(-2) = Impacts considered to be moderately reduced when compared with the proposed Project.

(-1) = Impacts considered to be somewhat reduced when compared with the proposed Project.

(0) = Impacts considered to be equal to the proposed Project.

(+1) = Impacts considered to be somewhat increased when compared with the proposed Project.

(+2) = Impacts considered to be moderately increased when compared with the proposed Project.

(+3) = Impacts considered to be substantially increased when compared with the proposed Project.

Where significant unavoidable impacts would occur across different alternatives but there are impact intensity differences between those alternatives, numeric differences are used to differentiate alternatives (i.e., in some cases, there are differences at the individual impact level, such as differences in number of impacts or relative intensity).

Table 4-3: Comparison of Alternatives to the Existing Condition (Operational)

Environmental Resource	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 – Nature Focused Alternative	Alternative 2 – Sports Focused Alternative	No Project Alternative
Aesthetics	-2	-2	-2	0
Air Quality	-1	-2	-1	0
Biological Resources	-1	-2	-1	0
Cultural Resources	0	0	0	0
Energy	-1	-2	-1	0
Geology and Soils	0	0	0	0
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	-1	-2	-1	0
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	+2	+2	+2	0
Hydrology and Water Quality	+1	+1	+1	0
Land Use and Planning	0	0	0	0
Noise and Vibration	-1	-1	-1	0
Population and Housing	0	0	0	0
Public Services	-1	-1	-1	0
Recreation	-2	-2	-2	0
Transportation/Traffic	+1	+1	+2	0
Utilities and Service Systems	0	0	0	0
Total	-6	-10	-5	0
Ranking	2	1	3	0

Notes:

(-3) = Impacts considered to be substantially reduced when compared with the existing condition.

(-2) = Impacts considered to be moderately reduced when compared with the existing condition.

(-1) = Impacts considered to be somewhat reduced when compared with the existing condition.

(0) = Impacts considered to be equal to the existing condition.

(+1) = Impacts considered to be somewhat increased when compared with the existing condition.

(+2) = Impacts considered to be moderately increased when compared with the existing condition.

(+3) = Impacts considered to be substantially increased when compared with the existing condition.

Where significant unavoidable impacts would occur across different alternatives but there are impact intensity differences between those alternatives, numeric differences are used to differentiate alternatives (i.e., in some cases, there are differences at the individual impact level, such as differences in number of impacts or relative intensity).

4.6 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be identified. The environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least amount of significant impacts. As shown in **Table 4-1**, none of the alternatives would result in significant impacts. Although the No Project Alternative would result in the fewest impacts on the existing environment, this alternative would not result in the improvements anticipated under the proposed Project, Alternative 1, or Alternative 2. The No Project Alternative would not result in the following improvements, as described in Section 4.4.1: enhanced visual character and quality of the Project Site, remediated soils, increased park and recreational facilities, and improved bicycle and pedestrian access. In addition, the existing industrial land use under the No Project Alternative would contribute greater air quality and greenhouse gas emissions and noise and vibration levels than the land uses associated with the proposed Project (except during large events).

Pursuant to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, when the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative from the remaining alternatives. As noted in **Table 4-1**, impacts associated with the proposed Project, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 would be similar. Under Alternative 1, smaller event capacity and reduced recreational programming would result in less project-generated vehicle traffic to the Project Site than the proposed Project. As such, implementation of Alternative 1 would result in marginally less impacts to Air Quality, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise and Vibration, and Transportation and Traffic than the proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative 1 is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

CEQA Guidelines do not require an agency to select the environmentally superior alternative (CEQA Guidelines 15042-15043). Because Alternative 1 would provide reduced programming compared to the proposed Project, it would not meet the recreational needs of the surrounding communities. At the community meetings, the public overwhelmingly supported the proposed Project as the preferred alternative because it meets all of the objectives described in Section 4.2.

This page intentionally left blank.