

CHAPTER 6.0 ALTERNATIVES

Rationale for Alternatives Selection

CEQA requires the consideration of alternatives to a project and the analysis of impacts associated with these alternatives. Through comparison of these alternatives to the project, the advantages of each can be weighed and analyzed. Section 15126.6 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, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” The alternatives analysis should look for ways to further mitigate the effects of a project. Thus, the selection and analysis of alternatives presented in this section do not include any alternatives that assume an increase in growth and development beyond that associated with the 2012 General Plan.

Additionally, the CEQA Guidelines state:

- The specific alternative of “no project” shall also be evaluated along with its impact. If the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (Section 15126.6[e][1][2]).
- An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The range of potential alternatives to the project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly discuss the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii), infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts (Section 15126.6[a][c]).

In addition to focusing on alternatives capable of either avoiding or substantially lessening any significant environmental effects of the 2012 General Plan, the following analysis examines variations of the 2012 General Plan that were considered during its preparation and that may be considered further during the public hearing process. The alternatives analyzed in this Program EIR are general, as is the 2012 General Plan. The degree of specificity used in the alternatives analysis is related to the general level of information associated with implementation of the 2012 General Plan. Development over the entire planning area is addressed in the alternatives analysis, rather than specific development projects. The following alternatives are examined:

- No Project/Existing General Plan
- Extensive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Alternative
- Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative

These alternatives were developed in the course of planning and environmental review for the 2012 General Plan. The following is provided in this section:

- A description of alternatives considered.
- An analysis of whether each alternative meets most of the basic objectives of the 2012 General Plan, as described in Chapter 2.0, Project Description, of this Program EIR.
- A comparative analysis of the alternatives under consideration and the 2012 General Plan. The focus of this analysis is to determine if alternatives are capable of avoiding or reducing the significant environmental effects of the 2012 General Plan. Table 6-1 summarizes the comparison of impacts of each alternative to the 2012 General Plan. Based on this comparison, both the Extensive TDM Alternative and the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative are environmentally superior to the 2012 General Plan.

Table 6-1
Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives to the 2012 General Plan

Environmental Issue Area	No Project/Existing General Plan	Extensive Transportation Demand Management Alternative	Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative
Aesthetics	Greater	Similar	Less
Air Quality	Similar	Less	Less
Biological Resources	Similar	Similar	Similar
Cultural Resources	Similar	Similar	Similar
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Greater	Less	Less
Hazards/Hazardous Materials	Similar	Similar	Similar
Hydrology/Water Quality	Greater	Similar	Similar

Environmental Issue Area	No Project/Existing General Plan	Extensive Transportation Demand Management Alternative	Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative
Land Use and Planning	Similar	Similar	Similar
Noise	Greater	Less	Less
Palaeontological Resources	Similar	Similar	Similar
Population and Housing	Similar	Similar	Similar
Public Services, Utilities, and Energy	Greater	Similar	Less
Transportation and Traffic	Greater	Less	Less
Conclusion	Environmentally Inferior	Environmentally Superior	Environmentally Superior

Greater – environmental impact is greater than the 2012 General Plan.

Similar = environmental impact is similar to the 2012 General Plan.

Less = environmental impact is less than the 2012 General Plan.

6.1 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

Alternate Project Location Alternative

The CEQA Guidelines recommend considering an alternative location to reduce potential impacts of a proposed project. However, the policies and programs of the 2012 General Plan are specific to the geographic context of La Mesa. Applying the policies and programs pursuant to the 2012 General Plan at another location is infeasible for a plan that applies only to properties within the City's jurisdiction. Thus, this Program EIR does not examine the Alternate Project Location Alternative.

Alternative Land Use Designation for Three Sites within Caltrans Right-of-Way

The City, through the public participation processes, considered land-use alternatives for specific sites during preparation of the 2012 General Plan. During this process, land-use designation changes were suggested for three Caltrans right-of-way sites currently designated as transportation uses. One of these sites is located at the northwest corner of Fletcher Parkway and SR-125 and the other two sites are located on the northwest and southwest corners of Lemon Avenue and Bancroft Drive. The parcel at the northwest corner of Fletcher Parkway and SR-125 is proposed to be designated for Multiple Unit Residential land use consistent with adjacent land-use designations. For the two sites at Lemon and Bancroft, residential land-use designations were considered. However, given the relatively small size of each of these parcels and that they are situated adjacent to the freeway with high noise levels, heavy traffic volumes, and vehicle emissions, it was determined that residential development in these locations would be inappropriate. Therefore, the proposed land use designation changes were considered but rejected from inclusion in the General Plan, because implementing them would not decrease impacts within the planning area.

6.2 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT/EXISTING GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is analyzed within this Program EIR as it is required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e). According to Section 15126.6(c)(2), the “no project” analysis needs to discuss “what is reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.” When the project is the revision of an existing land-use policy, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A) states that “the No Project Alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan...into the future.” Therefore, for the purposes of this Program EIR, the No Project Alternative represents growth and development under the currently adopted General Plan, as further described below. This alternative does not represent a “no build” scenario in which no future growth, development, or redevelopment would occur.

This alternative assumes that the 2012 General Plan would not be adopted and implemented. Instead, the planning area would grow and develop according to the existing General Plan policies, programs, land-use designations, and development patterns that were adopted in 1996. The 2012 General Plan is similar in its land-use patterns and overall goals and objectives for the City to those identified in the adopted General Plan. However, the 2012 General Plan proposes land-use designation changes to eight sites (Table 6-2). These changes are proposed for new development and redevelopment at these locations.

Given that the 2012 General Plan land-use designations would not result in substantial changes from those included in the existing General Plan, it would be expected that population, housing, and employment in La Mesa by 2035 would be similar to conditions under the existing General Plan.

Adoption of the 2012 General Plan would result in 12.59 acres with changed land use designations from the adopted General Plan. Two sites would be changed from nonresidential use to multi-unit and urban residential use, while two other sites would change from urban and suburban residential use to public safety facilities. These changes would result in 3.71 more acres of residential use. The land-use changes would also result in 2.17 additional acres designated for commercial use that would no longer be designated for transportation or public uses.

**Table 6-2
Land Use Designation Changes
No Project/Existing General Plan vs. 2012 General Plan**

Site	Acreage	1996 General Plan Land Use Designation	2012 General Plan Land Use Designation
Former police station site at northeast corner of Allison Avenue and Nebo Drive	1.28 Acres	Public Use (Civic Center)	Downtown Commercial
Caltrans property west of SR-125 north of Fletcher Parkway	0.77 Acre	Transportation Uses (transportation right-of-way)	Multiple-Unit Residential (18 to 23 du/acre)
Former County of San Diego Public Works site at the northwest corner of Murray Hill Road and Waite Drive	2.94 Acres	Public Use (Public Works Facility)	Urban Residential (7 du/acre)
Mission Valley trolley extension	4.59 Acres	Mission Valley Trolley (proposed)	Transportation right-of-way (Trolley Station)
Vacant private parcel at the northwest corner of Lemon Avenue and Bancroft Drive	0.59 Acre	Transportation Uses (transportation right-of-way)	Local Serving Commercial
Vacant Caltrans parcel at the southwest corner of Lemon Avenue and Bancroft Drive	0.30 Acre	Transportation Uses (transportation right-of-way)	Local Serving Commercial
Fire Station 12 on Dallas Street, east of SR-125	1.75 Acres	Urban Residential (7 du/acre)	Public Use (Public Safety Facility)
Fire Station 13 on Grossmont Boulevard east of SR-125	0.37 Acre	Suburban Residential (4 du/acre)	Public Use (Public Safety Facility)
Total Acreage	12.59 acres		

du/acre = dwelling units per acre

In addition to the land-use designation changes, the 2012 General Plan also incorporates new policies and programs related to the following topics:

- Environmental and economic sustainability
- Community design, character, and historic preservation
- Reducing GHG emissions
- Active transportation
- Opportunities for growth and job creation
- Community involvement, health, and wellness
- Multijurisdictional relationships

Comparison of Environmental Impacts to the 2012 General Plan

Aesthetics

Implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in additional growth and development within La Mesa, but would not redesignate land-use changes at the

eight sites listed in Table 6-2. Therefore, this alternative could result in fewer impacts to visual character and views from the scenic highway segment of SR-125 and Mt. Helix. Fewer residential and commercial structures in these areas could result in less impacts from light and glare. However, the additional development on these eight sites would be subject to 2012 General Plan objectives and policies to maintain and enhance community character, improve the general visual quality of La Mesa, and improve community elements such as signage and streetscapes.

Conversely, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not include 2012 General Plan policies to maintain and enhance community character, improve the general visual quality of La Mesa, or improve community elements such as signage and streetscapes, while the 2012 General Plan would avoid or reduce the potential aesthetics impacts by applying these policies. In the absence of these policies and programs, impacts to aesthetics would be greater under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative than with implementation of the 2012 General Plan.

Air Quality

Implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in a slightly lower development capacity for residential units and a coinciding slightly lower population than the 2012 General Plan. Since there would not be a substantial reduction in building construction, residential population, or jobs compared with the 2012 General Plan, there would not be a substantial difference in the amount of construction, vehicle trips, or traffic congestion generated by projected growth and development. Air quality impacts related to mobile sources would still be significant based on the increase over existing conditions, and emissions of air pollution would continue to exceed federal and state standards. Both the 2012 General Plan and the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not result in a conflict or obstruct implementation of the air quality plan or objectionable odors, but would violate air quality standards and impacts to sensitive receptors. Therefore, impacts to air quality for this alternative would be similar to the 2012 General Plan.

Biological Resources

Development patterns under both the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative and 2012 General Plan would be similar and subject to the same state and federal environmental review requirements and regulation for the protection of sensitive and endangered species and habitats. Critical habitat protections related to the HCP and MSCP would be the same. Impacts to biological resources would be similar under the 2012 General Plan and the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative.

Cultural Resources

Development patterns under both the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative and 2012 General Plan would be similar and would result in a similar impact to cultural resources. Future land uses and infill development permitted under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would generally be the same as the 2012 General Plan, and may result in changes that affect historic structures or the historic character of neighborhoods or districts. New infill development allowed under the existing General Plan would have the potential to disturb archaeological deposits that could be discovered during the course of ordinary excavation and construction activities. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in similar impacts as the 2012 General Plan.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in a slightly lower development capacity for residential units and a coinciding slightly lower population than the 2012 General Plan, resulting in slightly fewer GHG emissions from construction and increased traffic. However, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not implement the policies of the 2012 General Plan designed to reduce energy consumption and vehicle trips, or apply other sustainability principals, resulting in increased GHG emissions relative to the 2012 General Plan and overall greater impacts relating to GHG emissions.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would include similar land-use designations as the 2012 General Plan, and build-out would result in a slightly lower number of residential units and square feet of nonresidential use, including square feet of uses that could potentially require the transportation, use, and storage of hazardous materials or buildings located on the Cortese List. Development under this alternative would also be subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations that are designed to prevent and remedy harm from hazards or hazardous materials. Therefore, implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in similar impacts as the 2012 General Plan.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Overall, land-use and development patterns of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be similar to the 2012 General Plan, and would also be subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations that are designed to lessen impacts to hydrology and water quality and persons and property located within flood zones. However, the No Project/Existing General Plan

Alternative would not implement the policies of the 2012 General Plan designed to further reduce impacts to hydrology and water quality and flood damage prevention. Therefore, this alternative would result in greater impacts to hydrology and water quality than the 2012 General Plan.

Land Use

No change would occur to general land-use and development patterns under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative. This alternative would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Impacts to land use for this alternative would be similar to the 2012 General Plan.

Noise

Overall land use and development patterns of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be similar to the 2012 General Plan. Implementation of this alternative would result in slightly less residential development capacity, but generally would result in a similar level of noise impacts from construction and to sensitive receptors. Implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not implement the policies of the 2012 General Plan designed to decrease vehicle trips and would result in greater impacts to transportation and traffic than the 2012 General Plan, which would result in greater noise levels. This alternative would also not implement policies included in the 2012 General Plan related to noise compatibility between land uses and noise reduction strategies. Therefore, implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in greater noise impacts than the 2012 General Plan.

Paleontological Resources

Overall land use and development patterns of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be similar to the 2012 General Plan, and implementation of this alternative would also result in potential impacts to paleontological resources from ground disturbance. Therefore, implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in similar impacts to paleontological resources as the 2012 General Plan.

Population and Housing

Implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in a slightly lower development capacity for residential units and a coinciding slightly lower population than

the 2012 General Plan. Implementation of this alternative would not induce population growth and would not displace housing units. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in population and housing impacts similar to the 2012 General Plan.

Public Services, Utilities, and Energy

Implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in a slightly lower development capacity for residential units and a coinciding slightly lower population than the 2012 General Plan. However, policies of the 2012 General Plan designed to reduce water use, energy consumption, solid waste and wastewater generation, and environmental impacts from construction of new development and redevelopment would not be implemented under this alternative. Therefore, implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in greater environmental impacts associated with future demands for public services, utilities, and energy than the 2012 General Plan.

Transportation and Traffic

As previously discussed, implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in a slightly lower development capacity for residential units and a coinciding slight reduction in vehicle trips and roadway traffic congestion. However, this reduction would not be substantially less than what would result from implementation of the 2012 General Plan. In addition, this alternative would not implement the policies of the 2012 General Plan that are designed to reduce vehicle trips through encouragement of public transit use and “active” (biking, walking) transportation. Therefore, implementation of the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in greater impacts to transportation and traffic than the 2012 General Plan.

No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative Conclusion

Build-out under the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would result in slightly fewer dwelling units and nonresidential development, and slightly fewer people than would be forecasted under the 2012 General Plan, but overall land use patterns would remain the same. This alternative would result in similar environmental impacts as the 2012 General Plan in the areas of air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use, paleontological resources, and population and housing.

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would not implement the new goals, objectives, or policies included in the 2012 General Plan, and would result in greater environmental impacts to aesthetics, GHG emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, public

services and utilities, and transportation and traffic. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is not environmentally superior to the 2012 General Plan.

6.3 ALTERNATIVE 2: EXTENSIVE TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVE

The Extensive TDM Alternative would use the same basic land-use and policy assumptions as the 2012 General Plan, but would include additional and/or enhanced TDM policies, as shown in Table 6-3. In this alternative, the enhanced TDM policies would facilitate a shift in the number of existing and new automobile trips to transit, biking, and walking by increasing mobility options, providing incentives to use transit, and adjusting parking requirements and costs. This alternative would set a goal to achieve a 35 percent increase in the mode share of alternative transportation commute modes over the next 5 years. A new goal would be set every 5 years. This alternative would require new development and redevelopment to contribute to those goals, as described in Table 6-3. In addition, this alternative would require businesses with 100 or more employees to implement an annual commute-trip reduction plan each year, describing travel-reduction measures to be undertaken by the company.

Comparison of Environmental Impacts to the 2012 General Plan

Aesthetics

Implementation of the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in the same land-use designations and development capacity and intensification of La Mesa as the 2012 General Plan. Both this alternative and the 2012 General Plan would include policies regarding aesthetic improvements such as landscaping and design standards for architecture and lighting. Future development would also be subject to existing building and development standards specified in the City's Zoning Code. Therefore, aesthetics impacts would be similar for the 2012 General Plan and the Extensive TDM Alternative.

Air Quality

The Extensive TDM Alternative would include the same land-use designations as the 2012 General Plan, and build-out would result in a similar number of residential units and square feet of nonresidential use, and a similar increase in population. Because the level of development would be equivalent under this alternative, construction-related air-quality impacts would be similar. New development and redevelopment allowed under both the 2012 General Plan and the Extensive TDM Alternative have the potential to expose more sensitive receptors to new and existing sources of air pollution. However, the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in lower traffic volumes on most roadway segments, and would have fewer intersections that operate at an unacceptable LOS compared to the 2012 General Plan.

**Table 6-3
Comparison of Transportation Demand Management Features of Extensive TDM Alternative vs. 2012 General Plan**

TDM Measure	2012 General Plan	Extensive TDM Alternative
Reduced or Eliminated Auto Parking Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use off-street and on-street parking to satisfy requirements within the Commercial Light Industrial land use designation. Reduce parking requirements for development in the downtown area or near transit. Use shared parking provisions for differing land uses on the same subject property. Provide parking-reduction incentives for transit-oriented and mixed-use development, consistent with regional standards, for more-intense development and higher-density residential uses along major transportation corridors or in areas accessible to transit use. Develop a set of standards and guidelines for the effective and equitable design and distribution of on-street and off-street parking. 	<p>In addition to the policies and programs of the 2012 General Plan, this alternative would do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminate minimum parking requirements and set low maximum parking requirements for new development.
Unbundled Auto Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City currently does not require unbundled auto parking (i.e., rent or sell parking spaces separately, rather than automatically including them with building space). The 2012 General Plan would not change this policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require all new development to unbundle parking.
Pricing of Public Auto Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City currently does not implement demand-responsive pricing. The 2012 General Plan would not change this policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement demand-responsive pricing in public on- and off-street parking.
Bike Network Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement policies and programs identified in the adopted Bicycle Facilities and Alternative Transportation Plan. Require new developments to provide for on- and off-street improvements that advance the City's "complete streets" objectives. Apply a "complete streets" approach to future transportation infrastructure projects. Work with Caltrans to eliminate safety hazards and improve connectivity across freeways and adjacent on- and off-ramps for bicyclists and pedestrians, consistent with the La Mesa Freeway Crossing Study. Provide on-street and off-street parking for bicycles to support adjacent land uses. Design bicycle facilities in accordance with Caltrans design 	<p>This alternative would change the following policy of the 2012 General Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement all improvements identified in the adopted Bicycle Facilities and Alternative Transportation Plan within 5 years. <p>In addition to the policies and programs of the 2012 General Plan, this alternative would do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require new development to provide off-street parking for bicycles. Require businesses to provide bicycle racks, lockers, and showers for employees who bicycle to and from work.

**Table 6-3
Comparison of Transportation Demand Management Features of Extensive TDM Alternative vs. 2012 General Plan**

TDM Measure	2012 General Plan	Extensive TDM Alternative
<p>Pedestrian System Improvements</p>	<p>criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage pedestrian and bicycle safety training for school students enrolled in La Mesa schools. • Seek opportunities to provide pedestrian and bicycle connections between neighborhoods and activity centers along easements and other areas where vehicles are not permitted. • Provide new site amenities, such as bike racks, as development occurs. • Continue to pursue Safe Routes to School funding for public schools and work to improve cooperation with local school districts to be eligible for additional funding opportunities. • Increase connectivity and safety within 0.25-mile of a school site with pedestrian-oriented and traffic-calming infrastructure. • Encourage pedestrian and bicycle safety training for school students. • Work with Caltrans to eliminate safety hazards and improve connectivity across freeways and adjacent on- and off-ramps for bicyclists and pedestrians, consistent with the La Mesa Freeway Crossing Study. • Implement improvements identified in the adopted Sidewalk Master Plan as funding becomes available. • Require new developments to provide for on- and off-street improvements that advance the City's "complete streets" objectives. • Apply a "complete streets" approach to future transportation infrastructure projects. • Build on the information in the "Safe Routes to Transit" section of the 2012 Bicycle Facilities and Alternative Transportation Plan to improve the transit passenger experience within the City. • Prioritize pedestrian system improvements within 0.25-mile of transit services. • Seek opportunities to provide pedestrian and bicycle 	<p>This alternative would change the following policy of the 2012 General Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement all improvements identified in the adopted Sidewalk Master Plan within 5 years. <p>In addition to the policies and programs of the 2012 General Plan, this alternative would do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate with private schools located within the City and adjacent cities to develop Safe Routes to School programs/projects and apply for funding.

**Table 6-3
Comparison of Transportation Demand Management Features of Extensive TDM Alternative vs. 2012 General Plan**

TDM Measure	2012 General Plan	Extensive IDM Alternative
	<p>connections between neighborhoods and activity centers along easements and other areas where vehicles are not permitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage the use of wider sidewalks where higher levels of pedestrian activity occur and use of noncontiguous sidewalk design where appropriate to help separate pedestrians from auto traffic. 	
Transit System Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocate for improvements to public transit facilities and continue to coordinate with MTS to improve access to public transit. Continue to develop and apply design standards applicable to future developments that improve access to public transit. Consider designing transit preferential treatment on streets with high-volume transit activity to enhance efficiency of transit services. Include night lighting at bus stops to increase visibility and security for transit passengers. 	<p>In addition to the policies and programs of the 2012 General Plan, this alternative would do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocate for expedited funding of improvements identified in the SANDAG Early Action Program with targeted improvements to enhance regional/through-connectivity to jobs, educational institutions, and services. Require a bulletin board displaying information about public transit services at all multi-family residences and nonresidential development.
Subsidized Transit Passes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City currently does not have a policy regarding subsidized transit passes. The 2012 General Plan would not change this policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide full transit subsidies for all employees and residents in the City.
Fare-Free Transit Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City currently does not have a policy regarding fare-free transit zones. The 2012 General Plan would not change this policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create a fare-free transit zone so that all transit trips originating within City boundaries are fare free.
Auto Parking Cash-Out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City currently does not have a policy regarding auto parking cash-out programs. The 2012 General Plan would not change this policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create parking cash-out requirement to all businesses if the employer subsidizes or provides free parking for employees.
Car Sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City currently does not have a policy regarding car-sharing programs. The 2012 General Plan would not change this policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require new development to implement an on-site car sharing program or pay into a fund to incentivize a car sharing operator to implement a City-wide program. Pursue multijurisdictional car sharing program with regional partners, including neighboring cities, the County of San Diego, and SANDAG.

**Table 6-3
Comparison of Transportation Demand Management Features of Extensive TDM Alternative vs. 2012 General Plan**

TDM Measure	2012 General Plan	Extensive TDM Alternative
Bicycle Sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City currently does not have a policy regarding bicycle sharing programs. The 2012 General Plan would not change this policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement a Citywide bicycle sharing program. Pursue multijurisdictional bike sharing programs with regional partners, including neighboring cities, the County of San Diego, and SANDAG.
Carpooling/ Vanpooling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage businesses, organizations, and residents to participate in the implementation of regional TDM, including carpooling programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target a moderate to high increase in employee participation rates in carpools and vanpools through additional promotional efforts by the City, mode split performance targets for new development, and public or private subsidies. Require designated parking for carpools/vanpools close to building entrances and/or carpool/vanpool drop-off areas.
Telecommuting Alternative Work Schedules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage businesses, organizations, and residents to participate in the implementation of regional TDM, including carpooling programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target a moderate to high increase in employee participation rates in telecommuting and alternative work schedules for employees to promotional efforts by the City, mode split performance targets for new development, and public or private subsidies.

Implementation of this alternative would result in generally similar impacts associated with construction sources, fewer impacts associated with mobile sources, and similar impacts associated with stationary sources. Because mobile sources are the largest contributor to air-quality impacts, the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in fewer air-quality impacts compared to the 2012 General Plan. However, air-quality impacts related to mobile sources would still be significant based on the increase over existing conditions, and implementation of this alternative would not avoid any significant air-quality impacts of the 2012 General Plan.

Neither the 2012 General Plan or Extensive TDM Alternative would result in a conflict or obstruct implementation of the air quality plan or create objectionable odors, but would violate air-quality standards and impacts to sensitive receptors.

Biological Resources

Development patterns under both the Extensive TDM Alternative and 2012 General Plan would be similar and subject to the same state and federal environmental review requirements and regulation for the protection of sensitive and endangered species and habitats. Critical habitat protections related to the HCP and MSCP would be the same. Impacts to biological resources would be similar under the 2012 General Plan and the Extensive TDM Alternative.

Cultural Resources

Development patterns under both the Extensive TDM Alternative and 2012 General Plan would be similar and would result in a similar impact to cultural resources. Future land uses and infill development permitted under the Extensive TDM Alternative would generally be the same as the 2012 General Plan and may result in changes that affect historic structures or the historic character of neighborhoods or districts. Similar to the 2012 General Plan, new infill development allowed under the Extensive TDM Alternative would have the potential to disturb archaeological deposits that could be discovered during the course of ordinary excavation and construction activities. Therefore, the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in similar impacts to cultural resources as the 2012 General Plan.

GHG Emissions

The Extensive TDM Alternative would include the same land-use designations as the 2012 General Plan, and build-out would result in a similar number of residential units and square feet of nonresidential use, and a similar increase in population. Because the level of development would be equivalent under this alternative, direct and indirect GHG emissions from construction-related activities, non-road emissions, natural gas combustion for space and water heating,

stationary-source emissions from electricity generation at off-site utility providers, water conveyance and distribution, solid waste disposal, and treatment of water and wastewater would be similar to those associated with implementation of the 2012 General Plan.

Operational GHG emissions from fuel combustion under this alternative would be less than the 2012 General Plan due to fewer vehicle trips and shorter average trip length. As a result, overall GHG emissions resulting from this alternative would be less than that for the 2012 General Plan. Neither the 2012 General Plan nor the Extensive TDM Alternative would conflict with the AB 32 Scoping Plan or any other plans, policies, or regulations for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Extensive TDM Alternative would include the same land-use designations as the 2012 General Plan, and build-out would result in a similar number of residential units and square feet of nonresidential use, including square feet of uses that could potentially require the transportation, use, and storage of hazardous materials or buildings located on the Cortese List. Development under this alternative would also be subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations and policies designed to prevent and remedy harm from hazards or hazardous materials. Therefore, implementation of the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in similar impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as the 2012 General Plan.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Overall land-use and development patterns of the Extensive TDM Alternative would be similar to the 2012 General Plan. Development under this alternative would also be subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations and policies designed to prevent and lessen impacts to hydrology and water quality and persons and property located within flood zones. Therefore, implementation of the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in similar impacts related to hydrology, water quality, and flooding risk as the 2012 General Plan.

Land Use

Land-use and development patterns of the Extensive TDM Alternative would be the same as under the 2012 General Plan. This alternative would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Impacts to land use under the Extensive TDM Alternative would, therefore, be similar to the 2012 General Plan.

Noise

The Extensive TDM Alternative would include the same land-use designations as the 2012 General Plan, and build-out would result in a similar number of residential units and square feet of nonresidential use, and a similar increase in population. A similar number of residents would be exposed to more noise sources under the 2012 General Plan and Extensive TDM Alternative. Because the level of development would be equivalent under this alternative, exposure of sensitive noise receptors to ambient noise and vibration levels from short-term construction-related activities would be similar to implementation of the 2012 General Plan. Both the Extensive TDM Alternative and 2012 General Plan would result in similar impacts associated with noise from industrial and commercial operations and aircraft noise. However, long-term project-generated traffic-source noise levels for this alternative along local roadways would be lower than with implementation of the 2012 General Plan due to the substantial reduction in vehicle trips and traffic congestion from current conditions. Therefore, the overall noise impact of this alternative would be less than that of the 2012 General Plan.

Paleontological Resources

Overall land-use and development patterns of the Extensive TDM Alternative would be similar to the 2012 General Plan, and implementation of this alternative would also result in potential impacts to paleontological resources from ground disturbance. Therefore, implementation of the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in similar impacts to paleontological resources as the 2012 General Plan.

Population and Housing

The Extensive TDM Alternative would include the same land-use designations as the 2012 General Plan, and build-out would result in a similar number of residential units and square feet of nonresidential use, and a similar increase in population. Implementation of both the 2012 General Plan and the Extensive TDM Alternative would not induce population growth and would not displace housing units. Therefore, the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in similar impacts to population and housing compared to the 2012 General Plan.

Public Services, Utilities, and Energy

The Extensive TDM Alternative would include the same land-use designations as the 2012 General Plan, and build-out would result in a similar number of residential units and square feet of nonresidential use, and a similar increase in population. This alternative would result in a similar need for additional public services, utilities, and energy, and expansion or construction of

associated facilities. Therefore, implementation of the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in similar impacts associated with future demands for public services, utilities, and energy as the 2012 General Plan.

Transportation and Traffic

Implementation of the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in a substantial reduction in traffic volumes on most roadway segments and fewer arterials that operate at an unacceptable LOS compared to the 2012 General Plan. Therefore, implementation of the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in less impacts to transportation and traffic than the 2012 General Plan.

Extensive TDM Alternative Conclusion

Build-out under the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in an equivalent amount of new development compared to the 2012 General Plan. Both the 2012 General Plan and the Extensive TDM Alternative would include new objectives and policies aimed at reducing demand for automobile travel, supporting improved access to transit, improving pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and supporting transportation system management, but the Extensive TDM Alternative would include additional, and more stringent, policies. Through enforcement of these policies, the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in lower per-capita VMT and vehicle hours traveled, fewer trips generated, and shorter average trip length compared to the 2012 General Plan and, therefore, less impacts to transportation and traffic. The potential decrease in traffic congestion would result in a reduced increase in air pollutants, GHG emissions, and noise from roadway traffic compared to the 2012 General Plan.

Since other policies of the 2012 General Plan would be included in this alternative, and land-use designations would also remain the same, the Extensive TDM Alternative would result in similar impacts to aesthetics; biological resources; cultural resources; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use; paleontological resources; population and housing; and public services, utilities, and energy. Overall, less impacts would result from the Extensive TDM Alternative. Therefore, the Extensive TDM Alternative is environmentally superior to the 2012 General Plan.

6.4 ALTERNATIVE 3: REDUCED GROSSMONT SPECIFIC PLAN ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would implement the goals and policies of the 2012 General Plan, with some modifications. A 64-acre mixed-use site in the Grossmont Specific Plan, currently home to the Grossmont Shopping Center, is identified as a potential site for 3,851 multi-family residential units. This site, bounded by Center Drive to the north, Murray

Drive to the south, Jackson Drive to the west, and Grossmont Center Drive to the east, is currently designated Regional Commercial, which allows mixed-use development with no cap on residential density. The Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would place a cap on residential density to reduce the number of residential housing units that could be developed in the Grossmont Specific Plan area by 50 percent to 1,925 units. The Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would decrease the total number of housing units that could potentially be developed in La Mesa by nearly 2,000 units. The Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative assumes the same capacity of nonresidential development as the 2012 General Plan.

Comparison of Environmental Impacts to the 2012 General Plan

Aesthetics

The Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in buildings of shorter height and/or less density in the Grossmont Specific Plan area than would be developed through the land-use designations included in the 2012 General Plan. Build-out of this alternative would result in fewer impacts to visual character and views from redevelopment of the Grossmont Specific Plan area than build-out of the 2012 General Plan. Both this alternative and the 2012 General Plan would include policies regarding aesthetic improvements such as landscaping and design standards for architecture and lighting. Future development would also be subject to existing building and development standards specified in the City's Zoning Code. Therefore, the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in less aesthetics impacts compared to the 2012 General Plan.

Air Quality

Build-out under the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in approximately 1,925 fewer dwelling units and, consequently, fewer people than would be forecast under the 2012 General Plan. Because the level of development would be less under this alternative, construction-related and long-term air-quality impacts from traffic congestion would be less than under the 2012 General Plan. In addition, there would be fewer sensitive receptors to new and existing sources of air pollution. However, air-quality impacts related to construction and mobile sources would still be significant based on the increase over existing conditions.

Both the 2012 General Plan and the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would not result in a conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air quality plan, and would not create objectionable odors. The Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in less impacts to air quality compared to the 2012 General Plan.

Biological Resources

Development patterns under both the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative and 2012 General Plan would be similar and subject to the same state and federal environmental review requirements and regulation for the protection of sensitive and endangered species and habitats. Critical habitat protections related to the HCP and MSCP would be the same. Impacts to biological resources would be similar under the 2012 General Plan and the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative.

Cultural Resources

Build-out under the Reduced Grossmont Center Specific Plan Alternative would result in approximately 1,925 fewer dwelling units and, consequently, fewer people than would be forecast under the 2012 General Plan. Although there would be fewer dwelling units constructed, redevelopment of the Grossmont Specific Plan area may still have the same footprint of ground disturbance under this alternative as under the 2012 General Plan, and would result in a similar impact to cultural resources.

In addition, future land uses and infill development in areas outside of the Grossmont Specific Plan area would generally be the same as with the 2012 General Plan, and may result in changes that affect historic structures or the historic character of neighborhoods or districts. Similar to the 2012 General Plan, new infill development allowed under the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would have the potential to disturb archaeological deposits that could be discovered during the course of excavation and construction activities. Therefore, the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in similar impacts to cultural resources as the 2012 General Plan.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Implementation of the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in less development of residential units and a coinciding lower population than the 2012 General Plan, resulting in fewer GHG emissions from construction and traffic. The Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would also implement the proposed policies of the 2012 General Plan designed to reduce energy consumption and vehicle trips, and apply other sustainability principals. Therefore, GHG emissions as a result of implementing the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would be less compared to implementing the 2012 General Plan.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would include the same land-use designations as the 2012 General Plan, including square feet of uses that could potentially require the transportation, use, and storage of hazardous materials or buildings located on the Cortese List. Development under this alternative would also be subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations and policies designed to prevent and remedy harm from hazards or hazardous materials. Therefore, implementation of the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in similar impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as the 2012 General Plan.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Development under the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would be subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations and policies designed to prevent and lessen impacts to hydrology and water quality and persons and property located within flood zones. Therefore, implementation of the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in similar impacts related to hydrology, water quality, and flooding risk as the 2012 General Plan.

Land Use

Land-use patterns of the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would be the same as under the 2012 General Plan, although there would be less intensity of residential units in the Grossmont Specific Plan area. This alternative would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the planning area adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Land-use impacts under the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would be similar to the 2012 General Plan.

Noise

The Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would include the same land-use designations as the 2012 General Plan, but would allow approximately 1,925 fewer residential units and, consequently, fewer people. Fewer residents would be exposed to more noise sources under this alternative than the 2012 General Plan. Because the level of development would be less under this alternative, ambient noise and vibration levels from short-term construction-related activities would be less than implementation of the 2012 General Plan. Both the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative and 2012 General Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts to noise from industrial and commercial operations and aircraft noise. Long-term project-generated traffic noise levels along local roadways would be less for this alternative than with

implementation of the 2012 General Plan due to the reduction in vehicle trips and traffic congestion associated with fewer residential units.

Paleontological Resources

Development under the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in approximately 1,925 fewer dwelling units and, consequently, fewer people than would be forecast under the 2012 General Plan. Although there would be fewer dwelling units constructed, redevelopment of the Grossmont Specific Plan area may still have the same footprint of ground disturbance under this alternative as under the 2012 General Plan, and would result in a similar impact to paleontological resources.

Population and Housing

Development under the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in approximately 1,925 fewer dwelling units and, consequently, fewer people than would be forecast under the 2012 General Plan. Implementation of both the 2012 General Plan and the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would not induce population growth and would not displace housing units. Therefore, the Reduced Grossmont Center Specific Plan Alternative would result in impacts to population and housing that are similar to the 2012 General Plan.

Public Services, Utilities, and Energy

Development under the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in approximately 1,925 fewer dwelling units and, consequently, fewer people than would be forecast under the 2012 General Plan. This alternative would result in less need for additional public services, utilities, and energy, and expansion or construction of associated facilities. Therefore, implementation of the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in less impacts than the 2012 General Plan associated with the need for new construction attributable to additional demands for public services, utilities, and energy.

Transportation and Traffic

Development under the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in approximately 1,925 fewer dwelling units and, consequently, fewer people than would be forecast under the 2012 General Plan. Implementation of the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in a reduction in traffic volumes on most roadway segments, but this reduction would not be substantial and would not result in fewer arterials that operate at an unacceptable LOS compared to the 2012 General Plan. Implementation of the Reduced

Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in fewer impacts to transportation and traffic, but impacts would still be significant under this alternative, as under the 2012 General Plan.

Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative Conclusion

Development under the Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in similar land-use patterns but 1,925 fewer residential units, and, consequently, fewer residents in the Grossmont Specific Plan area compared to the 2012 General Plan. Development under the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative would result in less impacts related to aesthetics; air quality; GHG emissions; noise; public services, utilities, and energy; and traffic and transportation. Impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, palcontological resources, and population and housing would be similar as the 2012 General Plan. Therefore, the Reduced Grossmont Specific Plan Alternative is environmentally superior to the 2012 General Plan.

This page intentionally left blank.