
V. ALTERNATIVES
A. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B), the No Project Alternative (Alternative A) assumes that the project would not be approved and no new development would occur within the project site. Thus, the physical conditions of the Griffith Park Campus, including the existing surface parking areas adjacent to the Campus, would remain as they are today. None of the existing facilities would be expanded, the existing buildings would continue to function as they currently do, and the existing on-site associated surface parking would remain unchanged. A comparative summary of the environmental impacts of the proposed project and Alternative A is presented in Table 33 on page 270.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

(1) Aesthetics

The No Project Alternative would not change the aesthetic conditions within the project site. The proposed project would alter the aesthetic conditions on the project site by adding new building volume and relocating parking areas to the eastern portion of the site. At the same time, the project would present a new landscaping program intended to enhance the attractiveness of the site, and replace the existing parking frontage along Western Heritage Way with landscaping, thus better anchoring the site improvements within the natural components of Griffith Park. Nonetheless, no aesthetic impacts under the No Project Alternative would occur and such impacts would be less than under the project.

The No Project Alternative would result in no new building placement on the project site. Thus, no impacts on existing views would occur. The project's development would not notably alter view conditions in the public viewsheds of off-site population, and its potential view impacts were concluded to be less than significant. Nonetheless, view impacts associated with the No Project Alternative would be less than under the project.

The project would introduce some new lighting on-site, with an overall lighting appearance that would be similar to existing conditions and thus, less than significant. Under the No Project Alternative, no new lighting would be introduced. Thus, no impacts associated with light and glare would occur and such impacts would be less than those occurring under the project.

Under the No Project Alternative, no new development would be added to the project site and therefore there would be no new shade/shadow effects. The proposed project would add new shading to the project site. However, such shading would not adversely affect off-site sensitive receptor locations. Nonetheless, as no shading impacts would occur under the No Project Alternative, such impacts would be less when compared with the proposed project.

(2) Air Quality

Under the No Project Alternative, the project's short-term significant air quality construction impact due to construction NO_x emissions would be avoided. Further, regional construction impacts associated with other emissions (i.e. VOC, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO, and SO_x), and localized construction impacts on NO_x, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5} and CO which are adverse, but less than significant under the proposed project, would also not occur. Also, the project's less than significant operational regional impacts on VOC, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO, SO_x, and NO_x and localized operational impacts on CO would not occur. Thus, air quality impacts associated with construction and operation would be less under the No Project Alternative. Impacts regarding toxic air contaminants, odors, and consistency with SCAQMD and SCAG policies would also not occur under the No Project Alternative and such impacts would be less when compared with the proposed project.

(3) Cultural Resources

Under the No Project Alternative, grading would not occur. Thus, potential impacts associated with uncovering of archeological and paleontological resources would not occur and such impacts would be less when compared with the project.

Under the No Project Alternative no structures on the project site would be altered. However, there are no historic buildings within the project site. Thus, as with the proposed project, no impacts associated with historic resources would occur.

(4) Hydrology/Water Quality

As no construction would occur under the No Project Alternative, there would be no change in the existing site drainage conditions on the project site. There are currently no flooding conditions on the project site, nor are there runoff conditions that result in impacts on water quality that are not typical runoff conditions associated with the existing site uses, such as parking areas, etc. Development of the proposed project may result in a small increase in impermeable surface area that might potentially increase run-off potential. However, the project includes Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would comply with the requirements of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Such BMPs include use of detention basins to control stormwater runoff such that surface flows would be equivalent to or below

existing levels. Further, the project's BMPs would protect water quality through a variety of site design measures that control site contaminants from otherwise entering the regional water system. Nonetheless, no impacts on hydrology or water quality resulting from construction and operation would occur under the No Project Alternative and such impacts would be less when compared with the proposed project.

(5) Land Use

The No Project Alternative assumes that the project would not be developed and that the existing Campus Building within the project site would remain unchanged. The existing site uses would continue to contribute to Griffith Park's value as a regional amenity with the provision of a visitor oriented cultural/educational facility that is consistent with current plans and regulations pertaining to the project site. At the same time, the No Project Alternative would preclude an opportunity to enhance an existing facility and provide a greater service to the community in a manner that is consistent with current plans and regulations. Nonetheless, no impacts associated with consistency with land use plans and regulations would occur under the No Project Alternative and such impacts would be less than those under the proposed project.

With regard to land use compatibility, under both the No Project Alternative and the proposed project, the site would provide for a visitor oriented cultural facility lying adjacent to the freeways and across from the Zoo parking lot. Thus, neither the No Project Alternative nor the proposed project would intrude upon or interfere with off-site uses. Nonetheless, no impacts on land use compatibility would occur under the No Project Alternative and such impacts would be reduced when compared with the proposed project.

(6) Noise

Under the No Project Alternative, increased noise levels associated with short-term construction activities and an increase in vehicle trips and building area as part of ongoing operations would not occur. In contrast, the proposed project would increase construction noise levels at off-site receptors (i.e. the Zoo, golf courses and Zoo Magnet Center). However, the project includes mitigation measures that would reduce the short-term construction noise impacts to levels that would be less than significant. Overall, construction noise impacts would be less under the No Project Alternative than with the proposed project.

The project would generate increased noise due to additional mechanical equipment on the project site and additional traffic. However, the increased noise levels would not be perceptible at off-site locations. Nonetheless, no operational noise impacts would occur under the No Project Alternative and such impacts would be less than those under the proposed project.

(7) Public Services – Fire Protection

Under the No Project Alternative, no change in the existing use of the project site or the demand for fire protection, fire flow, or emergency vehicle access would occur when compared to existing conditions. In comparison, construction activities under the proposed project could increase the demand on fire services. However, the proposed project would meet required access, fire flow, hydrant, and building design specifications. Therefore, the impacts of the proposed project relative to fire services would be less than significant. Nonetheless, since the No Project Alternative would not increase the demand for fire services when compared to existing conditions, impacts relative to fire services due to operation and construction would be less under the No Project Alternative than under the proposed project.

(8) Traffic and Circulation

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no impacts on traffic due to construction. However, construction traffic impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant due to the opportunity to perform construction staging on-site, worker trips occurring during off-peak hours, and the implementation of a construction traffic and parking management plan. Nonetheless, traffic impacts under the No Project Alternative would be less than those of the proposed project.

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no increase in daily and peak-hour traffic, and circulation conditions would be the same as expected under the future baseline traffic conditions described in Section IV.H, Transportation and Circulation. Nonetheless, future traffic conditions would worsen due to anticipated ambient growth.

Under the proposed project, no significant traffic or access impacts would occur. Nonetheless, traffic and access impacts associated with operation of the project site under the No Project Alternative would be less when compared with the proposed project.

Similar to existing conditions, the proposed project would provide sufficient parking to meet the on-site demand. Nonetheless, under the No Project Alternative, an increased demand for parking would not occur and parking impacts would be less when compared with the project. However, it is important to note that the pedestrian and bus access improvements that would be provided under the project, would not be provided for under the No Project Alternative.

3. RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the project's basic objectives. It would not allow the Autry National Center to meet the project's Mission Objectives. Specifically, Mission Objectives that would not be met include those that regard the provision of

expanded exhibition, storage and collection management, and educational research facilities and the provision of a design that contributes to the project's intended synergy between the Autry National Center's display, interpretation, conservation and education roles, whereby these functions converge into a greater experience beyond that which occurs when provided independently. In addition, under the No Project Alternative, Mission Objectives to enhance the visitor experience, to enhance the Griffith Park Campus as a visitor destination, and to enhance the economic sustainability of the Autry National Center would be curtailed.

Further, the Program Objectives would not be met under the No Project Alternative. Specifically, the Autry National Center would not be able to create a research environment that is supportive of artifact and archival history, to stimulate the "convergence" dialogue, or to develop interpretative programs that demonstrate the interconnected stories of Native Americans and new arrivals from around the world. Other Program Objectives intended to improve the operational program of the Autry National Center would also not be met. Specifically, the No Project Alternative would not provide new exhibition spaces that would have the appropriate light, temperature and humidity controls for the protection of artifacts, nor would this Alternative provide greater public access to larger segments of the collection, or enhance the visitor experience with improved entertainment, retail and café facilities. Further, the Program Objectives regarding the needed upgrade to the buildings, infrastructure and parking would not be met.

Finally, the No Project Alternative would not meet the project's Design Objectives. The No Project Alternative would not allow the Griffith Park Campus to have a design that creates a unified campus or celebrates the convergence of the cultures that shape the American West. The No Project Alternative would also not allow the Autry National Center to provide a design of the Griffith Park Campus that better supports and enhances its Griffith Park setting. Design Objectives to create a "museum-inside-out" that reveals a greater amount of the collection, to support sustainability, and to create an enhanced visitor entryway would also not be met under the No Project Alternative.