PART IV REVISED DRAFT EIR

Chapter 1 SUMMARY

This chapter is a summary of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the implementation of the proposed Collier Park Renovations Project Master Plan, prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This chapter highlights the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis for the proposed project, as required by Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines. It also provides a brief description of the proposed project's features, objectives, and alternatives to the proposed project. In addition, this chapter provides a table summarizing: 1) the potential environmental impacts that would occur from implementation of the proposed project; 2) the level of impact significance before mitigation; 3) the recommended mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts; and 4) the level of impact significance after mitigation measures are implemented. A table summarizing the comparative impacts of the project alternatives is also provided.

1.1 Overview

As required by CEQA, this EIR does the following: 1) assesses the potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of the proposed project; 2) identifies potential feasible means of avoiding or substantially lessening significant adverse impacts; and 3) evaluates a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, including the required No Project Alternative. The City of La Mesa is the "lead agency" for the proposed project evaluated in this EIR and as such has the principal responsibility for approving the proposed project.

Pursuant to Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Project EIR has been prepared for the proposed project. A Project EIR examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project. It focuses primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from development of the proposed project during construction and operation.

1.2 Project Description

The project proposes the construction of recreational facilities and other improvements at Collier Park in the City of La Mesa, San Diego County, California. The proposed project is organized into four areas: 1) Panhandle; 2) Spring House; 3) History Hill; and 4) Collier Club House. The improvements associated with each project area include the following:

- Panhandle. The Panhandle area, which is situated in the southern and western portions of the park, is primarily developed for recreational use with existing facilities such as a tennis court, playground, restrooms, picnic area, and parking lot. Proposed improvements in the Panhandle area include relocation and reconstruction of the drinking fountain structure; replacement of the playground, restrooms, tennis court, ~~bus stop,~~ and parking; and installation of walking paths, landscaping, drainage, and security features.
- Spring House. The existing Spring House is located adjacent to the Panhandle area of Collier Park. As part of the proposed project, the City is proposing to mothball the existing building to protect it from weather and vandalism. Mothballing the Spring House would be done in accordance with the *National Park Service's Preservation Brief #31: Mothballing Historic Buildings*. This preservation practice may be put into place when funds are not currently available to put a deteriorating structure into a useable condition. Section 4.3.2.2 provides greater detail on the process of mothballing the Spring House.~~The City is exploring various options with regard to the existing Spring House, which is located adjacent to the Panhandle area of the park. For the purposes of the EIR, the proposed project addresses the partial demolition of the Spring House and replacement with an outdoor interpretive center, which is considered the worst-case scenario. The other options for the Spring House are described in Section 8, Alternatives.~~
- History Hill. The History Hill area, which is situated in the southeastern portion of the park, currently consists of mostly undeveloped parkland. The History Hill area would be converted into a grassy amphitheater built into the hillside and would also include installation of walking paths, landscaping and security features.
- Collier Club House. The Collier Club House area, which is situated in the northern portion of the park, currently consists of mostly undeveloped parkland. Proposed improvements in the Collier Club House area include construction of a club house building, an outdoor event area including ~~(~~two outdoor seating areas and a ceremony stage~~)~~, a plaza area, and parking, as well as the installation of walking paths, landscaping, and security features.

The proposed project would be completed in phases, generally corresponding to the four project areas described above, with each phase of project construction anticipated to occur over a six to 14 month period. The Panhandle area would be constructed first and would be completed prior to the construction of the other three phases. The remaining areas may be constructed in any order and may be constructed concurrently. Dates of construction are currently unknown. For this analysis, it is assumed that construction of the Panhandle area would begin in 2015~~3~~, and construction of the other phases would begin as early as 2016~~4~~. A more detailed project description is provided in Chapter 4, Project Description, of this EIR.

1.3 Project Objectives

The objectives of the proposed project, as established by the City of La Mesa, are listed below:

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

1.4 Impact Summary

This EIR examines the potential environmental effects of the proposed project, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of project-level and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts. In accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the following environmental topics were identified as requiring detailed analysis in this EIR:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Transportation and Traffic

Table 1-1, presented at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed project and identifies feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts, as discussed in detail in Chapter 5, Existing Conditions, Impacts, and Mitigation, of this EIR. Based on this environmental impact analysis, implementation of the Collier Park Renovations Project Master Plan would result in potentially significant impacts associated with the following issues:

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

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

The cumulative impact analysis determines whether the proposed project's incremental effect would be "cumulatively considerable" when viewed in connection with the effects of past, present, or probable

future projects. A cumulative impact is not considered significant if the effect would be essentially the same whether or not the proposed project is implemented. Table 1-2, presented at the end of this chapter, identifies the potentially significant cumulative impacts to which the proposed project may contribute, as discussed in detail in Chapter 6, Cumulative Impacts, of this EIR.

Impacts to the following environmental topics were determined to be "Effects Not Found to be Significant" according to Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines: Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities and Services Systems. These environmental topics are discussed in Chapter 7, Other CEQA Considerations, of this EIR.

1.5 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

The objective of the alternatives analysis is to consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to foster informed decision-making and public participation. The following alternatives to the proposed project are analyzed in detail in Chapter 8, Alternatives, of this EIR:

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

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. The Spring House Restoration Alternative would avoid the significant but mitigable impacts identified for the proposed project related to excessive noise levels because the Collier Club House outdoor event area would not be constructed, and would avoid the significant but mitigable impact related to historic resources because the contributing features to the Collier Park historic district, including the Spring House, concrete-lined drainage channel, concrete rubble bridge and stairway, embossed 1925 sewer manhole, tennis court, drinking fountain, and historic trees, would be restored in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Restoration. This alternative would also reduce impacts associated with archaeological resources, paleontological resources, unstable soils, and expansive soils as compared to the proposed project, although these impacts would still require mitigation. In addition, the Spring House Restoration Alternative would increase impacts associated with site drainage/hydrology as compared to the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would only fully meet two of the project objectives and partially meet the remaining two objectives. Furthermore, this alternative may not be economically feasible given the high cost of restoration.

Table 1-3, presented at the end of this chapter, provides a summary comparison of each alternative to the proposed project with the purpose of highlighting whether the alternative would result in a similar, greater, or lesser impact than the proposed project. Please refer to Chapter 8, Alternatives, of this EIR for a detailed description of each impact comparison identified in Table 1-3.

1.6 Issues Raised by Agencies and the Public

Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the summary of an EIR to include areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency including issues raised by agencies and the public. On October 17, 2011, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Collier Park Renovations Project Master Plan EIR was distributed by the City of La Mesa. The State Clearinghouse assigned reference number SCH # 2011101051 to the EIR. In accordance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the NOP was circulated to interested agencies, groups, and individuals for a period of 30 days, during which time comments were solicited pertaining to environmental topics and issues that the EIR should evaluate. The NOP comment period ended on November 16, 2011. Comment letters were received from the following agencies: California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC provided a description of state and federal statutes related to cultural resources and requested that the NAHC be provided with pertinent project information. The DTSC requested that the EIR evaluate whether conditions in the project area would pose a threat to human health or the environment and recommended mitigation for potential impacts related to contaminated soil and other hazards. The NOP and associated comment letters are provided in Appendix A of this EIR.

Pursuant to Section 15083 of the CEQA Guidelines, an early public consultation meeting was held by the City of La Mesa on October 26, 2011, in which City staff discussed the EIR process with the public. Concerns raised by the public included the following:

- Changes to the aesthetics/visual character of Collier Park due to proposed development
- Loss of locally important historic resources within Collier Park, including the Spring House and open space areas (History Hill)
- Existing flooding and drainage issues in the Panhandle area
- Impacts of grading the entire site

- Noise caused by events at the proposed amphitheater and club house
- Additional traffic associated with increased park usage and events
- Intensified need for public services, such as police protection

All of the issues raised during the NOP comment period and at the early public consultation meeting have been addressed in Sections 5.1 through 5.10 of the EIR.

Table 1-1 Project Level Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
5.1 Aesthetics				
Scenic Vistas	The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway	The proposed project would not substantially damage any scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Visual Character	The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
New Sources of Light and Glare	The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
5.2 Air Quality				
Applicable Air Quality Plan	Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the San Diego County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) because it would not increase the frequency or severity of violations of existing air quality standards, contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or interim reductions as specified in the RAQS.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Air Quality Standards	Implementation of the proposed project would not exceed any air quality standard during construction or operation.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Cumulatively Considerable Emissions	The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact during construction or operation.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Sensitive Receptors	The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of carbon monoxide. The proposed project consists of park improvements and would not include any toxic air contaminant (TAC)-emitting land uses that could have adverse health effects on sensitive receptors.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Objectionable Odors	The proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
5.3 Biological Resources				
Special Status Species	A potentially significant impact related to special status species (specifically, nesting birds and raptors) would result from implementation of the proposed project.	S	**BIO-1** Avoidance of Nesting Birds. To prevent impacts to nesting passerines (song birds) and other non-raptors protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game (CFG) Code, the City shall enforce the following: 1) If construction occurs during the general nesting season for passerine birds (February 1 through August 31), and where any mature tree, shrub, or structure capable of supporting a bird nest occurs within 300 feet of proposed project construction activities, the City shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting birds prior to clearing, grading and/or construction activities. The survey shall be conducted within 72 hours prior to the start of construction. The construction contractor shall also retain a qualified biologist to monitor all clearing of vegetation during the general nesting season to ensure that construction activities stay within the project footprint and that any established avoidance buffers are being maintained. The biological monitor will submit weekly monitoring reports to the City during clearing of vegetation and shall notify the City immediately if project activities damage active nests. 2) If any nesting birds are present on or within 300 feet of the proposed project construction area, the City shall retain a qualified biologist to flag and demarcate the location of all nesting birds and monitor construction activities. Temporary avoidance of active bird nests, including the enforcement of an avoidance buffer of 300 feet, shall be required until the qualified biologist has verified that the young have fledged or the nest has otherwise become inactive. The biological monitor shall submit weekly monitoring reports to the City during clearing of vegetation and shall notify the City immediately if project activities damage active nests. Documentation of the nesting bird surveys and any follow-up monitoring, as necessary, shall be provided to the City within 10 days of completing the final survey or monitoring event. The avoidance buffer may be reduced from 300 feet to a minimum of 25 feet at the discretion of the monitoring biologist, and with written consent from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). If the biological monitor determines that a narrower buffer is warranted, the biological monitor shall provide USFWS and CDFG with a written explanation as to why. Based on the submitted explanation, USFWS and CDFG shall determine whether to allow the narrower buffer.	LS

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
			BIO-2 Avoidance of Nesting Raptors. To prevent impacts to nesting raptors protected under the MBTA and CFG Code, the City shall enforce the following: 1) If construction occurs during the raptor nesting season (January 15 through July 31), and where any mature tree or structure capable of supporting a raptor nest occurs within 500 feet of proposed project construction activities, the City shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting raptors prior to clearing, grading and/or construction activities. The survey shall be conducted within 72 hours prior to the start of construction. The construction contractor shall also retain a qualified biologist to monitor all clearing of vegetation during the raptor nesting season to ensure that construction activities stay within the project footprint and that an established avoidance buffers are being maintained. The biological monitor will submit weekly monitoring reports to the City during clearing of vegetation and shall notify the City immediately if project activities damage active nests. 2) If any nesting raptors are present on or within 500 feet of the proposed project construction area, the City shall retain a qualified biologist to flag and demarcate the location of all nesting raptors and monitor construction activities. Temporary avoidance of active raptor nests, including the enforcement of an avoidance buffer of 500 feet, shall be required until the qualified biologist has verified that the young have fledged or the nest has otherwise become inactive. The biological monitor shall submit weekly monitoring reports to the City during clearing of vegetation and shall notify the City immediately if project activities damage active nests. Documentation of the raptor surveys and any follow-up monitoring, as necessary, shall be provided to the City within 10 days of completing the final survey or monitoring event. The avoidance buffer may be reduced at the discretion of the monitoring biologist and with written consent from the USFWS and CDFG. If the biological monitor determines that a narrower buffer is warranted, the biological monitor shall provide USFWS and CDFG with a written explanation as to why. Based on the submitted explanation, USFWS and CDFG shall determine whether to allow the narrower buffer.	
Sensitive Natural Communities	No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities exist within the project site.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands	No jurisdictional waters and wetlands exist within the project site.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
Wildlife Corridors, Linkages, and Nursery Sites	The project site does not function independently or contribute to the assembly of any wildlife corridors, linkages, or nursery sites.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Biological Resources Protection Policies and Ordinances	New trees would be planted in accordance with the City's Tree Policy Manual, which provides a reference for existing guidelines, policies, and standards for the planting, care, preservation, maintenance, and replacement of trees. The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Adopted Habitat Conservation Plan	The project site does not function independently or contribute to the assembly of any wildlife corridors, linkages, or nursery sites, including any Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) core biological resource areas or linkages. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of the adopted La Mesa Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
5.4 Cultural Resources				
Historical Resources	A significant impact related to historical resources (contributing structures and landscape features of the ~~specifically, the~~ Collier Park district~~, including the Spring House and other contributing features~~) would result from implementation of the proposed project.	S	**CUL-1** Historic American Landscape Survey. Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) Level II documentation of the Collier Park district (including all ~~the Spring House and other~~ contributing structures and landscape features) shall occur prior to the start of construction activities for any phase of the proposed project. The HALS Level II documentation shall be prepared by a registered landscape historian in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation and the National Park Service's HALS Guidelines. In conformity with the HALS Level II standards, the documentation package shall include the following three elements: 1) a narrative historical report; 2) large-format photographic documentation; and 3) reproduction of select existing drawings. **CUL-2** Preservation Measures. The City shall implement ~~all of~~ the following two preservation measures: 1) ~~Retention~~ Preservation of the undamaged portions of the original roof frame and tiles in the reconstruction of the drinking fountain. ~~2) Retention of natural landscape features, such as the natural terrain, topography,~~	LS

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
			~~old-growth trees, and plantings undertaken by the local community (including succulents in the History Hill area), and incorporation thereof into the project design.~~ ~~3)~~2) Placement of interpretive signage throughout the park that conveys a brief history of Collier Park, its role and historical significance in the development of the City of La Mesa~~, and historical significance~~. At a minimum, signs shall be placed at the Spring House, current ~~and new~~ location~~s~~ of the drinking fountain, former location of the stone bridge and ~~tennis court,~~ water feature east of the Spring House, and in the general locale of the Panhandle and History Hill areas. ~~Interpretive signage shall include historic photographs of the Collier Park district.~~ Signs that include historic photographs shall be placed at a vantage point that provides direct observation of the view depicted. ~~Conduct oral history interviews with individuals identified in concert with the La Mesa Historical Society that have an association with Collier Park, such as descendants of Colonel David C. Collier and members of the Spring House Garden Club.~~	
Archaeological Resources	Ground-disturbing construction activities could result in impact to unknown archaeological resources, if uncovered.	S	**CUL-3** Archaeological and Native American Monitoring. An archaeological monitor and Native American monitor shall be present during all ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed soils. If an artifact is encountered, all operations in the area where the artifact was found shall be suspended immediately, the City shall be notified, and a qualified archaeologist and/or Native American monitor shall be retained by the City to evaluate the significance of the find; to salvage, record, clean, and curate significant artifact(s); and to document the find in accordance with current professional archaeological standards. Within 30 days of completion of ground-disturbing activities, either a letter signed by the archaeological and Native American monitors stating that no artifacts were found or, if artifacts were found, a report prepared by the qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor documenting the mitigation program shall be submitted to the City.	LS

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
Paleontological Resources	Ground-disturbing construction activities could result in impact to unknown paleontological resources, if uncovered.	S	**CUL-4** Paleontological Monitoring. A paleontological monitor shall be present during all initial cutting, grading, or excavation of previously undisturbed substratum. If a fossil of greater than 12 inches in any dimension (including circumference) is encountered, all operations in the area where the fossil was found shall be suspended immediately, the City shall be notified, and a qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the City to evaluate the significance of the find; to salvage, record, clean, and curate significant fossil(s); and to document the find in accordance with current professional paleontological standards. Within 30 days of completion of ground-disturbing activities, either a letter signed by the paleontological monitor stating that no fossils were found or, if fossils were found, a report prepared by the qualified paleontologist documenting the mitigation program shall be submitted to the City.	LS
Human Remains	Compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 in the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during construction would prevent significant impacts.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
5.5 Geology and Soils				
Seismic Hazards	It is unlikely that implementation of the proposed project would expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known fault, liquefaction, or landslides. Implementation of the proposed project would reduce the potential hazard from ground shaking by replacing the dilapidated Spring House with the structurally sound interpretive center.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Soil Erosion and Topsoil Loss	With implementation of the dust control measures and construction best management practices (BMPs), the proposed project would not result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Unstable Soils	Unstable soils potentially occur on the project site.	S	**GEO-1** Preliminary Grading Recommendations. Remedial grading of the project site shall be conducted in accordance with the following preliminary grading recommendations, as provided in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Geocon Incorporated 2010): 1) A pre-construction conference with the owner, contractor, civil engineer, and soil engineer in attendance shall be held at the site prior to the beginning of	LS

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
			grading operations. Special soil handling requirements shall be discussed at that time. 2) Earthwork shall be observed and compacted fill shall be tested by a geotechnical engineering consultant. 3) Grading of the site shall commence with the removal of existing improvements from the areas to be graded. Deleterious debris and unacceptable contaminated soil (if encountered) shall be exported from the site and shall not be mixed with the fill soil. Existing underground improvements within the proposed building areas shall be removed and the resulting depressions properly backfilled in accordance with the procedures described in the recommended grading specifications (refer to Appendix C of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation [Geocon Incorporated 2010]). 4) Topsoil and highly weathered or decomposed formational rock material (if encountered) shall be removed to expose firm formational rock materials. The actual depth of removal shall be evaluated by a geotechnical engineering consultant during the grading operations. In addition, the existing formational rock material shall be undercut at least three feet and replaced with compacted fill. The undercuts shall facilitate trenching/landscaping at the planned finish grade. 5) Roadways and utility areas underlain by hard rock units at grade shall be undercut a minimum of eight feet for the areas inside of the public right-of-way (including joint utility structures and sidewalk areas). The undercut zone shall include the areas within one foot of the lowest utility or drain line. 6) The existing upper four feet of undocumented fill within the area of planned structures or flatwork improvements shall be removed and replaced with compacted fill. The actual depth of removal shall be evaluated by a geotechnical engineering consultant during grading operations. A deeper removal may be determined subsequent to performing the supplemental geotechnical investigation. Prior to the placement of compacted fill, the exposed ground surface shall be scarified where possible, moisture conditioned as necessary, and properly compacted. 7) The bottom of the excavations shall be scarified to a depth of at least eight inches where possible, moisture conditioned as necessary, and properly compacted. To the extent practical, excavated soils with an Expansion Index	

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
			greater than 50 shall be kept at least three to four feet below finish grades in areas of structural fill. Sheet-graded pads shall be capped with at least six feet of low expansive soil to accommodate minor regarding. 8) If the remedial grading is limited due to the presence of utility lines or boundary conditions, partial removal and recompaction along with other corrective measures shall be implemented to accommodate the potential settlement. A geotechnical engineering consultant shall be contacted if this issue exists. 9) The site shall be brought to final grade elevations with structural fill. Excavated soil generally free of deleterious debris shall be placed as fill and compacted in layers to the design finish grade elevations. Fill and backfill soil shall be placed in horizontal loose layers approximately six to eight inches thick, moisture conditioned as necessary, and compacted to a dry density of at least 90 percent of the laboratory maximum dry density near to slightly above optimum moisture content as determined by ASTM D 1557. Rock greater than one foot in maximum dimension shall not be placed within three feet of finish grades or one foot of the deepest utilities. 10) Import fill shall consist of granular material with a "very low" to "low" expansion potential (Expansion Index of 50 or less) free of deleterious material or stones larger than three inches and shall be properly compacted as described in the recommended grading specifications (refer to Appendix C of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation [Geocon Incorporated 2010]). A geotechnical engineering consultant shall be notified of the import soil source and authorized to perform laboratory testing of import soil prior to its arrival at the site to evaluate its suitability as fill material. **GEO-2** Design Level Geotechnical Investigation. Prior to the approval of the grading permit for each phase of the project, a design-level geotechnical investigation pursuant to Section J104 of the California Building Code shall be conducted by a qualified geotechnical consultant based on project grading plans. The geotechnical investigation shall include laboratory testing of onsite soils. If necessary, the geotechnical consultant shall identify and recommend more detailed grading recommendations to be implemented during grading of the project site. Any recommendations made by the geotechnical consultant shall be incorporated into the final grading plans.	
Expansive Soils	Expansive soils potentially occur on the project site.	S	Implementation of mitigation measures GEO-1 and GEO-2 (described above) would reduce this impact to below a level of significance.	LS

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
5.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
Direct and Indirect Generation of GHG Emissions	Implementation of the proposed project would not generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that would have a significant impact on the environmental.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Applicable GHG Emissions Reduction Plan, Policy, or Regulation	Implementation of the proposed project would not generate GHG emissions that would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
5.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
Use and Release of Hazardous Materials	Compliance with all applicable regulations during construction and operation would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Hazards to Schools	Use of common hazardous materials in accordance with labeled instructions and compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to the handling and storage of hazardous materials, including California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) regulations and the California Fire Code, would prevent a significant hazard to nearby schools.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Hazardous Materials Sites	Due to the progress of remediation and the direction of groundwater flow downstream to the south and away from Collier Park, it is unlikely that contaminants from an existing leaking underground storage tank (LUST) cleanup site have migrated to the project site.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Airports Safety Hazards	Implementation of the proposed project would not result in airport safety hazards for people residing or working in the project area.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans	The proposed project would not impair an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
Wildland Fires	Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk due to wildland fire because the project site is not located in a community considered at risk from wildland fire.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
5.8 Hydrology and Water Quality				
Water Quality Degradation	With compliance with applicable regulations, the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality and impacts related to water quality.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Drainage Alterations	Implementation of construction BMPs would minimize the potential for erosion and siltation and would control surface runoff such that flooding does not occur and off-site flow does not exceed the capacity of the City's storm water drainage system. Construction BMPs would also minimize the discharge of polluted runoff from the project site. Following construction, off-site flow would be minimal and would not exceed the capacity of the City's storm water drainage system. Furthermore, implementation of post-construction BMPs would minimize the discharge of polluted runoff from the project site.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Flood Hazards	The proposed project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflows	The proposed project would not result in inundation by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow because the project site is not located in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
5.9 Noise				
Excessive Noise Levels	A potentially significant impact related to excessive noise levels (specifically, crowd noise generated by events at the proposed outdoor event area in the Collier Club House area) would result from implementation of the proposed project.	S	**NOI-1** Limit Hours of Use. Consistent with Section 9.08.140 of the La Mesa Municipal Code, Collier Park shall be closed between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. Additionally, events at the Collier Club house outdoor event area shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. ~~Event Hour Restrictions. Events at the Collier Club House outdoor event area shall be restricted to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.~~ **NOI-2** Evening~~t~~ Capacity Limitation~~s~~. Active events at the Collier Club House outdoor event area, such as concerts, shall be limited to a maximum of 100 guests during daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., and a maximum of 25 guests in the evening hours between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. Events with up to 50 guests may be permitted between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m., subject to approval by the City, provided that the event is a quiet, intimate event similar to events hosted at the proposed amphitheatre, such as a wedding ceremony. **NOI-3** Facility Rental Agreement. Events at the Collier Club House outdoor event area shall require a Rental Agreement between the event host and the City of La Mesa. The Rental Agreement shall include a security deposit that incorporates compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance. At a minimum, the Rental Agreement shall include the following rules to limit noise: 1) The host must demonstrate that a permit for operation of any sound amplifying equipment has been obtained; 2) Event capacities will be consistent with the limitations established in mitigation measure Noi-2; 3) Evening events will incorporate signage or verbal reminders for guests to be respectful of surrounding residents; 4) Security deposit will be forfeited if noise complaints are received from more than one adjacent residence; and ~~1)~~5) Any other rules the City deems appropriate based on the nature of the proposed event. Depending on the size and scope of the event, the host may be required to meet with the City to discuss event details and conditions prior to the event. Such events would include, but not be limited to, concerts and performances.	LS

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
			If the event is found to be out of compliance with any section of the City Noise Ordinance or Rental Agreement, including noise level limits, the event shall be shut down immediately, and the host's security deposit shall be forfeited. ~~**NOI-3 Noise Barrier. Prior to operation of the Collier Club House outdoor event area, a noise barrier shall be constructed along the northern edge of Collier Park to attenuate noise levels at the residences adjacent to the park's northern boundary, as shown in Figure 5.9-2. The wall shall be a sufficient height and building material to attenuate noise to below the ambient noise level or the City's noise limits in La Mesa Municipal Code Section 10.80.040, as applicable. The noise wall shall be of sufficient height to attenuate noise levels by approximately 13 dBA. The final location, height, and building material of the noise barrier shall be determined by a qualified acoustical engineer and subject to approval by the City.~~	
Excessive Groundbourne Vibration	A potentially significant impact related to excessive groundborne vibration (specifically, vibration generated by construction activities in the southern and southwestern portions of the park that would occur within 200 feet of dental offices) would result from implementation of the proposed project.	S	**NOI-4** Construction Notification ~~to Vibration-Sensitive Land Uses~~. The construction contractor shall provide written notification to the four dental offices located to the south of Collier Park at least three weeks prior to the start of construction activities within 200 feet of these offices, informing them of the estimated start date and duration of daytime vibration-generating construction activities. This notification shall include a ~~businesses. The dental offices are located at 4323 and 4333 Palm Avenue. This notification shall include the estimated start date and duration of daytime vibration-generating construction activities, as well as information~~ warning about the potential impacts related to vibration-sensitive equipment. The City shall provide a phone number for the affected businesses to call if they have vibration-sensitive equipment on their sites. If additional business licenses are issued for businesses with vibration-sensitive operations within 200 feet of Collier Park prior to completion of construction, written notification shall be provided to these businesses as well.	LS

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
			NOI-5 Vibration Best Management Practices. For construction activities within 200 feet of the four dental offices to the south of Collier Park ~~(located at 4323 and 4333 Palm Avenue)~~, the construction contractor shall implement the following measures during construction: 1) Construction activities that have the potential to generate high vibration levels at identified businesses with vibration-sensitive operations shall be scheduled during times that would have the least impact on nearby land uses. This could include restricting construction activities ~~vibration-sensitive receptors. For example, construction activities shall be restricted~~ in the areas of potential impact to the early and late hours of the work day, such as from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. or from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. 2) Stationary sources, such as temporary generators, shall be located as far from nearby vibration-sensitive receptors as possible. 3) Trucks shall be prohibited from idling along streets serving the ~~project~~ construction site where businesses with vibration-sensitive operations are located. If additional licenses are issued for businesses with vibration-sensitive operations within 200 feet of Collier Park prior to completion of construction, the vibration best management practices listed above shall be implemented for those businesses as well.	
Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise	The proposed project would not result in a significant increase in ambient noise levels along any project area roadway.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise	Because construction would comply with the applicable regulation for construction noise, temporary increases in noise level from construction activities would be less than significant.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Airport Noise	Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people to excessive aircraft noise.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A

Table 1-1 continued

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Key: S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; N/A = Not Applicable				
5.10 Transportation/Traffic				
Circulation System Performance	The addition of project traffic would not cause the level of service at any of the study area roadway segments or intersections to degrade to unacceptable levels. Based on the results of the roadway segment and intersection level of service analysis, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the City's Circulation Element.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Hazardous Design Features	Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A
Alternative Transportation Facilities	Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	LS	No mitigation required.	N/A

Table 1-2 Summary of Cumulative Impacts

Issue		Geographic Scope of Cumulative Impact Analysis	Significance of Cumulative Impact	Proposed Project Contribution
Key: NCI = No Cumulative Impact; S = Significant Cumulative Impact; N/A = Not Applicable				
Aesthetics		Viewshed of the proposed project	NCI	N/A
Air Quality		San Diego Air Basin	S	Not cumulatively considerable
Biological Resources		La Mesa Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan study area	S	Not cumulatively considerable with implementation of mitigation measures for direct impacts
Cultural Resources	Historical Resources	City of La Mesa	NCI	N/A
	Archaeological Resources/ Paleontological Resources/ Human Remains	San Diego region	S	Not cumulatively considerable with implementation of mitigation measures for direct impacts
Geology and Soils		Site specific	NCI	N/A
Greenhouse Gases		Global	S	Not cumulatively considerable
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Use and Release of Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Materials Sites	Project site and adjacent properties	NCI	N/A
	Airport Safety Hazards	Montgomery Field Airport Influence Area	NCI	N/A
	Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans/Wild land Fires	City of La Mesa	S	Not cumulatively considerable
Hydrology and Water Quality		Sweetwater Hydrologic Unit	S	Not cumulatively considerable
Noise		Project site and adjacent properties	S	Not cumulatively considerable with implementation of mitigation measures for direct impacts
Transportation and Traffic		Traffic Impact Analysis study area for the proposed project	S	Not cumulatively considerable

Table 1-3 Summary of Impacts for Alternatives Compared to the Proposed Project

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

Table 1-3 continued

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

This page intentionally left blank.