



V. ALTERNATIVES

V. ALTERNATIVES

A. PURPOSE OF THE ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

The identification and analysis of alternatives to a project is a fundamental aspect of the environmental review process under CEQA. Public Resources Code Section 21002.1(a) establishes the need to address alternatives in an EIR by stating that in addition to determining a project's significant environmental impacts and indicating potential means of mitigating or avoiding those impacts, the purpose of an environmental impact report is to identify alternatives to the project.

Direction regarding the definition of project alternatives is provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) as follows:

“An EIR shall 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, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”

The CEQA Guidelines emphasize that the selection of project alternatives be based primarily on the ability to reduce significant impacts relative to the proposed project, “even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.”⁸⁵ The CEQA Guidelines further direct that the range of alternatives be guided by a “rule of reason,” such that only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice be analyzed.⁸⁶

In selecting project alternatives for analysis, potential alternatives should be feasible. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1) states that:

“Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries,...and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site”

⁸⁵ CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b).

⁸⁶ *Ibid*, Section 15126.6(f).

The CEQA Guidelines require the analysis of a “no project” alternative and an evaluation of alternative location(s) for the project, if feasible. Based on the alternatives analysis, an environmentally superior alternative is to be designated. If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, then the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.⁸⁷

B. SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

As described above, the focus of an alternatives analysis is to identify alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of a project. Therefore, the selection of alternatives for this analysis is based on project variations that have the potential to reduce the Autry National Center’s Griffith Park Campus Improvement project’s single significant impact associated with air quality emissions during construction of the project. This significant impact is largely attributable to the amount of excavation and associated construction equipment that would be required to provide the new parking area and, in particular, the semi-subterranean parking structure on the project site. Therefore, alternatives have been selected that would reduce the amount of excavation required by placing the parking in an above ground structure, by placing parking at an off-site location, or by reducing the size of the project. In addition, an evaluation of an alternative site has been provided that includes an analysis of an expansion program at the Arroyo Campus in Mount Washington in lieu of expansion at the project site. A No Project Alternative has also been analyzed pursuant to the requirements of Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines. Accordingly, the alternatives analyzed below are as follows:

- Alternative A: No Project
- Alternative B: Reduced Program
- Alternative C: Above Ground Parking
- Alternative D: Off-site Parking
- Alternative E: Alternative Site – Expansion at the Arroyo Campus

Table 32 on page 266 summarizes the development programs for each of these alternatives. Each of these alternatives are described and evaluated in the sections that follow.

C. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), an EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons for their rejection. According to the CEQA Guidelines, among the factors that may be

⁸⁷ *Ibid*, Section 15126.6(e)(2).

Table 32

Alternatives Land Use Summary

Site Uses	Total with Proposed Project	Total with Alternative A: No Project	Total with Alternative B: Reduced Program	Total with Alternative C: Above Ground Parking	Total With Alternative D: Off-Site Parking	Total with Alternative E: Alternative Site – Arroyo Campus Expansion
Exhibit Gallery	68,968	43,518	68,968	68,968	68,968	22,500
Institute/Education/Community	19,821	9,019	9,019	19,821	19,821	21,000
Retail	8,210	4,056	8,210	8,210	8,210	2,000
Food Service	11,193	4,193	11,193	11,193	11,193	5,000
Collections Management	71,953	32,834	42,934	71,953	71,953	6,500
Other/Circulation/ Non-program Space	91,735	49,260	81,556	91,735	91,735	7,500
Total	271,880	142,880	221,880	271,880	271,880	64,500 (plus 142,884 existing at Griffith Park)
Parking	476	374	376	476	on-site - 363 off-site –113	110

used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration is the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Alternatives that have been considered and rejected are discussed below.

The first alternative that was identified, but subsequently rejected from further analysis, included an alternative use mix. Under this Alternative, the mix of uses developed within the project site would be varied. For example, the project might include an expanded amount of retail space and an increased educational component, while reducing the amount of exhibit space. Altering the use mix would not necessarily change the resulting impacts of the project, and would be less supportive of the project objectives which are best met through the particular use mix selected for the project.

A second rejected alternative included an alternative project design that would keep the Campus Building intact by expanding the Campus with new structures on the project site. For example, new exhibit space would be provided in a new stand-alone structure on the South Lawn, or the existing theatre would be used for exhibit space, with construction of a new theater on the South Lawn. Such a redesign of the project would not address the project's significant impact and would likely create new obstacles to providing the project's facilities and parking in a manner that provides the most attractive and cohesive site design/usage.

Additional alternatives that were considered and rejected included those that involve storage of a substantial part of the Autry's collections at an off-site location as well as decentralization of the various uses proposed within the Griffith Park Campus. The underlying purpose of the project is to expand and modernize the Griffith Park Campus to create an accessible, enlightening, inspiring, innovative and scholarly Campus and to provide a deeper understanding of the art, history and cultures of the American West. Key to this purpose are the objectives designed to create synergies between the Autry National Center's display, interpretation, conservation and education roles, as well as the objectives designed to create a research environment that is supportive of artifact history and archival history, to stimulate the "convergence" dialogue among researchers, curators and the public, and to develop interpretive programs that demonstrate the interconnected stories of Native Americans and new arrivals from around the world. Other primary objectives of the project that are intended to implement the underlying purpose of the project include the objective to provide public access to larger segments of the collection and the objective to create a "museum-inside-out" design with visible collections and staff areas to reveal the dynamic inner workings of the museum functions and place the greatest amount of the collection on display. Alternatives that include storage of a substantial part of the Autry's collections at an off-site location and/or decentralization of the various uses proposed within the Griffith Park Campus would be directly counter to the underlying purpose and key objectives of the project.

Placement of an above grade parking structure to the east of the Campus Building within the area used for employee parking and deliveries was also considered but rejected for a host of reasons. The area to the east of the Campus Building is a secure area that is also used for unloading and loading of collections and related materials. Thus, placement of a parking facility for visitors in this area would compromise the security of the area and would be inconsistent with the objective to ensure that a secure area is provided for the collections. In addition, use of this area for visitor parking would also not meet the project objective to provide an enhanced entryway that is visible to visitors since the public entrance to the building would not be visible from much of the parking area to the east.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2), consideration was given to locating the project at alternative locations. Specifically, as the Autry National Center also operates the Arroyo Campus in the Mount Washington area of Los Angeles, the Arroyo Campus has been given consideration as an alternative site for expansion of some of the project uses as Alternative E, analyzed below. Consideration was also given to relocating the entire Griffith Park Campus building area, including the project's additional 129,000 square feet of development, to the Arroyo Campus. However, based on the physical constraints discussed below in the evaluation of Alternative E, the Arroyo Campus does not lend itself to development of a 271,000 square foot facility, which is the building area that would result upon completion of the proposed project within Griffith Park. Further, the physical constraints of the Arroyo Campus would also not readily accommodate the 129,000 square foot expansion proposed for the project. Thus, based on the substantially greater environmental impacts that would result, both of these scenarios were rejected from further analysis.

Relocation of the project to other sites not operated by the Autry National Center would not be feasible. Specifically, the project involves remodeling and enhancing an existing Campus on a site already improved with utilities and surface parking. The costs for property acquisition and construction of an entirely new building and associated infrastructure would be prohibitive. Further, the current site is ideally suited for the project's purpose, as it is located on a relatively flat, developed site in a regional visitor facility with immediate freeway access. Thus, the possibility of finding an equally suitable site would be remote. Further, construction of the project at an alternative site would most likely result in greater impacts than project development at the existing location. Specifically, the only significant project-related impact occurring at the project site is a short-term air quality impact associated with grading and use of construction equipment. An entirely new development at an alternative site would require a far greater construction program than required at the existing site, thus resulting in greater construction impacts associated with air quality, traffic, and noise. Further, operational impacts would be greater with regard to traffic as an entirely new use would be interjected into an area that would not already have that use. In addition, depending on existing conditions, including surrounding/sensitive uses, impacts associated with aesthetics and noise could possibly be substantially increased when compared with the expansion of the existing Campus at the already developed project site.

D. ANALYSIS FORMAT

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), each alternative is evaluated in sufficient detail to determine whether the overall environmental impacts would be less, similar, or greater than the corresponding impacts of the project. Furthermore, each alternative is evaluated to determine whether the project objectives, identified in Section II, Project Description, would be substantially attained by the alternative.⁴ The evaluation of each of the alternatives follows the process described below:

- a. The net environmental impacts of the alternative after implementation of reasonable mitigation measures are determined for each environmental issue area analyzed in the EIR.
- b. Post-mitigation significant and non-significant environmental impacts of the alternative and the project are compared for each environmental issue area. Where the net impact of the alternative would be clearly less adverse or more beneficial than the impact of the project, the comparative impact is said to be “less.” Where the alternative’s net impact would clearly be more adverse or less beneficial than the project, the comparative impact is said to be “greater.” Where the impacts of the alternative and project would be roughly equivalent, the comparative impact is said to be “similar.”
- c. The comparative analysis of the impacts is followed by a general discussion of whether the underlying purpose and basic project objectives are substantially attained by the alternative.

Table 33 on page 270 provides a summary matrix that compares the impacts associated with the project with the impacts of each of the proposed alternatives.

⁴ *Ibid*, Section 15126.6(c).

Table 33

**Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Alternatives
and Impacts of the Proposed Project**

	Project Impact	Alternative A: No Project	Alternative B: Reduced Program	Alternative C: Above Ground Parking	Alternative D: Off-Site Parking	Alternative E: Alternative Site – Arroyo Campus Expansion
A. Aesthetics						
Aesthetics/Visual Character	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)
Views	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)
Light and Glare	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)
Shade and Shadow	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
B. Air Quality						
Construction						
Regional Emissions	Significant and Unavoidable	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less than Significant)	Greater (Significant and Unavoidable)
Local Emissions	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Potentially Significant)
Operations						
Regional Emissions	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Local Emissions	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)
Toxic Air Contaminants	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Odors	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Consistency w/ regulatory	Less Than	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less

Table 33 (Continued)

**Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Alternatives
and Impacts of the Proposed Project**

	Project Impact	Alternative A: No Project	Alternative B: Reduced Program	Alternative C: Above Ground Parking	Alternative D: Off-Site Parking	Alternative E: Alternative Site – Arroyo Campus Expansion
policies	Significant		Than Significant)	Than Significant)	Than Significant)	Than Significant)
C. Cultural Resources						
Paleontological Resources	Less than Significant w/Mitigation	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less than Significant w/Mitigation)	Less (Less than Significant w/Mitigation)	Less (Less than Significant w/Mitigation)	Similar (Less than Significant w/Mitigation)
Archeological Resources	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less than Significant)	Less (Less than Significant)	Less (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Historic Resources	No Impact	Similar (No Impact)	Similar (No Impact)	Similar (No Impact)	Similar (No Impact)	Greater (Less than Significant Impact)
D. Hydrology						
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)
E. Land Use						
Consistency with Plans	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Land Use Compatibility	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)
F. Noise						
Construction	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant w/mitigation)	Similar (Less Than Significant w/ mitigation)	Similar (Less Than Significant w/mitigation)	Greater (Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)

Table 33 (Continued)

**Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Alternatives
and Impacts of the Proposed Project**

	Project Impact	Alternative A: No Project	Alternative B: Reduced Program	Alternative C: Above Ground Parking	Alternative D: Off-Site Parking	Alternative E: Alternative Site – Arroyo Campus Expansion
G. Public Services – Fire						
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)
H. Traffic & Circulation						
Construction	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant w/Mitigation)	Similar (Less Than Significant w/Mitigation)	Greater (Less Than Significant w/Mitigation)	Greater (Less Than Significant w/Mitigation)
Intersection Operations	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Potentially Significant)
Regional facilities (CMP Impact)	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Transit	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Site Access	Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)
Parking	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Greater Potentially Significant)
Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
<hr/> <p><i>Source: PCR Services Corporation, 2007.</i></p>						