CHAPTER 4
MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVES

METHODOLOGY

This alternatives analysis discusses the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1 (No Golf Course), and Alternative 2 (Trail Access Only). Table 4-5-1, at the end of this chapter, presents a summary comparison of the alternatives impacts. Alternatives considered but dismissed during the planning process are also discussed. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) require EIRs to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to a project or its location that would attain the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or reduce significant effects of the project, and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. The Guidelines set forth the following criteria for selecting alternatives:

1. ...[T]he discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly. (§15126.6[b])

2. The range of potential alternatives 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. (§15126.6[c])

3. The specific alternative of "no project" shall also be evaluated along with its impact. (§15126.6[e][1])

4. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making. (§15126.6[f])

MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS

Prior to preparation of the Coyote Lake Harvey Bear Ranch County Park Master Plan, the County conducted an analysis of natural resources, cultural resources, and county-wide recreational trends. A Task Force of representatives from the public was convened and met publicly to consider elements to include within the Master Plan. A Technical Advisory Committee consisting of representatives from local, state and federal public agencies also was convened to provide input and guidance on the formulation of the Master Plan. A series of public workshops was held to present the Master Plan as it progressed and to solicit public comment. During this process, a
preliminary Environmental Analysis was completed which evaluated each of the proposed Master Plan components and alternatives. The Environmental Analysis was considered together with public and agency comments to form the proposed Master Plan and the three Master Plan alternatives described below.

**NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

**DESCRIPTION**

Under the No Action Alternative, neither the Master Plan nor the Natural Resources Management Plan would be implemented. The County would continue to implement existing protection, operations, and maintenance policies. The existing access to the Lakeside area would remain as is. Public access to this area would likely increase in proportion to population growth and recreational demand. No access would be granted to the Bear or Mendoza Ranch properties and no Master Plan improvements would occur. Park patrols and operation, grazing leases, erosion control, treatment of non-native species and pests, and road and facilities maintenance would continue at existing levels and intensities.

**IMPACTS AND REASONS FOR REJECTION**

Under the No Action Alternative, neither the Master Plan nor the Natural Resources Management Plan would be implemented and the County would continue to implement existing protection, operations, and maintenance policies. No access would be granted to the Bear or Mendoza Ranch properties and no unified Park improvements would occur. Implementation of actions and mitigation measures similar to those identified in the proposed Master Plan would likely reduce impacts, however, implementation of these actions and measures would occur on an individual basis, without the comprehensive management strategies presented in the Master Plan. The No Project Alternative would not address, or would only address in a partial and unsystematic manner, the goal of the Master Plan to enhance regional coordination and trail opportunities, provide a variety of sustainable interpretation and recreation opportunities, increase public access, and preserve and enhance natural and cultural resources. The No Project Alternative also would violate the County Parks Charter Fund directive to provide public parkland as these funds were used to purchase the Bear and Mendoza Ranches. Therefore, this alternative was rejected.

**MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVE 1: NO GOLF COURSE**

**DESCRIPTION**

Alternative 1 was evaluated during the Master Plan planning process under the title Alternative B. This alternative is similar to the proposed Master Plan with the mix of amenities offered. The primary difference between this alternative and the proposed Master Plan is the substitution of a 500 person events pavilion and recreational vehicle campground in lieu of the golf course proposed by the Master Plan for the Western Flat area. Although the golf course would not be
constructed, Alternative 1 would still be a positive contributor to the long term cost recovery of the Park.

Alternative 1 includes the following elements:

- 500 person events pavilion
- Bicycle Park
- Campground improvements: addition of showers and amphitheatre, and reduction of campground density
- Completion of staging areas
- Dog off-leash area
- Environmental education center
- Equestrian/agricultural events center
- Family and group picnic areas
- Fishing pond
- Hang-gliding launch and emergency landing site in northern area
- Hang-gliding launch and landing sites in Mendoza Area
- Historic restoration and interpretation
- Implementation of the Natural Resource Management Plan
- Improvements to existing Lakeside entrance area, visitor center and maintenance yard
- Informal lawn play area
- Lakeside group picnic area
- Lakeside pathway and fishing improvements
- Lakeside roadway safety improvements
- Mendoza Area family picnic sites
- New Lakeside campground (based on demand)
- Overflow parking/equestrian camping in West Flat Area by Special Use Permit
- Phase 1 trails, gates and fencing, staging areas at Western Flat Area and Mendoza Area, and trails naming and signage
- Phase 2 trails as described in the Trails Plan
- Phase 3 trails as described in the Trails Plan
- Re-alignment of the West Flat entrance road
- Recreational vehicle campground
- Self-launch areas for kayaks/non-motorized boats
- Use of southern pond for annual Fishability Days event
- Youth campground

IMPACTS AND REASONS FOR REJECTION

Under Alternative 1, the Park would implement program elements in the proposed Master Plan that differ from the proposed project only in the Western Flat Area, which would not include the golf course, and would support a larger events pavilion and recreational vehicle camping. All other components of the proposed Master Plan would be the same for the project- and program-level components in the Lakeside Area, Mendoza Ranch Area, Slopes and Ridge Area, the trails
plan and the Natural Resources Management Plan. Implementation of actions and mitigation measures similar to those identified in the proposed Master Plan would likely reduce impacts. This alternative was rejected because it would not generate sufficient revenue to off-set long-term management costs of the Park and would not serve as wide a range of recreational uses as the Preferred Alternative (see Goals and Need for the Master Plan in Chapter 2, Project Description).

MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVE 2: TRAIL ACCESS ONLY

DESCRIPTION

Alternative 2 is a trail access-only option that would respond only to the public's demand for pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle access to the Park. The trails and access plan would utilize only existing ranch roads and no new trails or re-routing of existing trails to avoid steep segments would be developed. Basic access and staging would be constructed for both the Western Flat and Mendoza Ranch areas. Unlike the No Action Alternative, Alternative 2 would provide access to both the Bear or Mendoza Ranch properties.

Alternative 2 includes the following elements:

- Completion of staging areas
- Trail access on existing ranch roads
- Limited access and staging for the Western Flat and Mendoza Ranch areas
- Limited trails naming and signage

IMPACTS AND REASONS FOR REJECTION

Alternative 2 provides only for the most basic access to the Park by utilizing existing system of ranch roads, and by developing two access and staging areas at areas that currently lack such facilities. Under this Alternative, the County would continue to implement existing protection, operations, and maintenance policies. The Natural Resource Management Plan would not be implemented and no unified Park improvements would occur. Implementation of actions and mitigation measures similar to those identified in the proposed Master Plan (but only those relevant to trails access) would likely reduce impacts. This Alternative would not address, or would only address in a partial and unsystematic manner, the goal of the Countywide Trails Master Plan Update to enhance regional coordination and trail opportunities, provide a variety of sustainable interpretation and recreation opportunities, and increase public access, nor would it meet the Master Plan goals and preserve and enhance natural and cultural resources. In addition, this alternative would not generate sufficient revenue to off-set long-term management costs of the Park (see Goals and Need for the Master Plan in Chapter 2, Project Description). Therefore, this alternative was rejected.
ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT DISMISSED

MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVE A

Alternative A was developed during the Master Plan planning process simultaneous with the proposed Master Plan (Master Plan Alternative C) and Alternative 1 (Master Plan Alternative B, described above) Alternative A is similar to both those alternatives with a mix of amenities offered. The primary difference between this alternative and the proposed Master Plan is the lack of an events pavilion or recreational vehicle camping facility in the Western Flat Area. An 18-hole golf course is common to this Alternative and the proposed Master Plan.

Alternative A included the following elements:

- Bicycle Park
- Campground improvements: addition of showers and amphitheatre, and reduction of campground density
- Completion of staging areas
- Dog off-leash area
- Environmental education center
- Equestrian/agricultural events center
- Family and group picnic areas
- Fishing pond
- Golf course
- Hang-gliding launch and emergency landing site in northern area
- Hang-gliding launch and landing sites in Mendoza Area
- Historic restoration and interpretation
- Implementation of the Natural Resource Management Plan
- Improvements to existing Lakeside entrance area, visitor center and yard
- Informal lawn play area
- Lakeside group picnic area
- Lakeside pathway and fishing improvements
- Lakeside roadway safety improvements
- Mendoza Area family picnic sites
- New Lakeside campground (based on demand)
- Overflow parking/equestrian camping in West Flat Area by Special Use Permit
- Phase 1 trails, gates and fencing, staging areas at Western Flat Area and Mendoza Area, and trails naming and signage
- Phase 2 trails as described in the Trails Plan
- Phase 3 trails as described in the Trails Plan
- Re-alignment of the West Flat entrance road
- Self-launch areas for kayaks/non-motorized boats
- Use of southern pond for annual Fishability Days event
- Youth campground
IMPACTS AND REASONS FOR REJECTION

Under Alternative A, the Park would implement program elements in the proposed Master Plan that differ from the proposed project only in the Western Flat Area, which would not include the events pavilion and recreational vehicle camping. All other components of the proposed Master Plan would be the same for the project- and program-level components in the Lakeside Area, Mendoza Ranch Area, Slopes and Ridge Area, the trails plan and the Natural Resources Management Plan. Implementation of actions and mitigation measures similar to those identified in the proposed Master Plan would likely reduce impacts. This alternative would not generate sufficient revenue to off-set long-term management costs of the Park (see Goals and Need for the Master Plan in Chapter 2, Project Description). Therefore, this alternative was rejected.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(d)(4) require an EIR to identify an environmentally superior alternative. The environmentally superior alternative was determined to be Alternative 1 because it would reduce development and development-related effects and would implement the Natural Resources Management Plan. Among the other alternatives, the No Action Alternative and Alternative 2 would also reduce development and development-related affects, however neither alternative would realize the benefits of the Natural Resources Management Plan. The No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, nor Alternative 2 would generate sufficient revenue to off-set long-term management costs of the Park. Therefore, these alternatives were rejected.
### TABLE 4-1
**COMPARISON OF MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction of facilities and improvements and implementation of controlled burning conducted under the Natural Resources Management Plan would cause criteria pollutant and dust emissions. Actions that reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level would be implemented.</td>
<td>• No new facilities would be constructed under the No Action alternative. If improvements to existing facilities are constructed, criteria pollutant and dust emissions would occur. Actions that reduce potential impacts could be proposed, similar to those proposed under the preferred alternative. However, implementation of actions and mitigation measures would not occur under a comprehensive plan. No controlled burning would occur.</td>
<td>• Construction of facilities and improvements and implementation of controlled burning conducted under the Natural Resources Management Plan would result in similar air quality impacts as described for the preferred alternative. Because no golf course would be constructed, air quality effects from vehicle emissions and grading would be reduced compared to the preferred alternative. Actions that reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level would be similar to those under the preferred alternative. The level of effort required would be similar to that required under the preferred alternative.</td>
<td>• Allows the least amount of new facilities (e.g., trails and trail staging areas only) and resultant air quality impacts. Actions that reduce potential impacts of these facilities to a less than significant level would be similar to those under the preferred alternative. However, the level of effort required would be less than under the preferred alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased access would not result in significant emissions related to increased vehicle trips.</td>
<td>• Public access would be less than under the preferred alternative. Therefore, potential operational impacts would not be significant.</td>
<td>• Increased access would be similar to preferred alternative. Therefore, this alternative would not result in significant emissions impacts.</td>
<td>• Public access would be less than under the preferred alternative. Therefore, potential operational impacts would not be significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Construction of new facilities, improvements, and implementation of management actions could impact biological resources. Actions that would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level include implementation of the Natural Resources Management Plan, best management practices during construction, and avoidance and compensation measures for sensitive species and sensitive habitats.</td>
<td>No new facilities would be constructed under the No Action alternative. If improvements to existing facilities are constructed, affects to biological resources could occur. Actions that reduce potential impacts could be proposed, similar to those proposed under the preferred alternative. However, implementation of actions and mitigation measures would not occur under a comprehensive plan.</td>
<td>Construction of facilities and improvements and implementation of the Natural Resources Management Plan would result in similar effects to biological resources as described for the preferred alternative. Because no golf course would be constructed, effects to biological resources would be reduced compared to the preferred alternative. Actions that reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level would be similar to those under the preferred alternative. The level of effort required would be similar to that required under the preferred alternative.</td>
<td>Allows the least amount of new facilities and improvements that could impact natural resources (e.g., trails and trail staging only). Potential effects to Bay checkerspot butterfly habitat would be similar to those described for the preferred alternative. Actions that reduce potential impacts would be included, but would not be as extensive as under the preferred alternative. The Natural Resources Management Plan would not be implemented. Therefore, the beneficial effects of this program would not be realized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased public access could impact biological resources. Includes actions and mitigation measures that would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.</td>
<td>The Natural Resources Management Plan would not be implemented. Therefore, the beneficial effects of this program would not be realized.</td>
<td>Public access would be similar to that required under the preferred alternative and would result in similar impacts to natural resources. Actions would be proposed that reduce potential impacts, similar to those proposed under the preferred alternative.</td>
<td>Public access would be less than under the preferred alternative. Therefore, potential operational impacts would not be significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4-1 (continued)
**COMPARISON OF MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction of new facilities could result in cultural resource impacts. Measures to protect cultural resources would be implemented that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</td>
<td>• No new facilities would be constructed under the No Action alternative. If improvements to existing facilities are constructed, affects to cultural resources could occur. Actions that reduce potential impacts could be proposed, similar to those proposed under the preferred alternative. However, implementation of actions and mitigation measures would not occur under a comprehensive plan. • Public access would be less than under the preferred alternative. Therefore, potential operational impacts would not be significant.</td>
<td>• Construction of facilities would result in similar potential for cultural resource impacts as preferred alternative. Because no golf course would be constructed, effects to cultural resources would be reduced compared to the preferred alternative. Actions to protect cultural resources would be implemented. • Allowed public access would result in similar potential for cultural resource damage as preferred alternative. Actions to protect cultural resources would be implemented.</td>
<td>• Construction of fewer new facilities would result in less potential for cultural resource impacts. Actions to protect cultural resources would be implemented. • Public access would be less than under the preferred alternative. Therefore, potential operational impacts would not be significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geology, Geohazards and Soils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction of additional facilities would increase potential for erosion and landslides. Actions to reduce soil erosion, and to identify, map, and reduce threats associated with landslides, would be implemented and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</td>
<td>• No new facilities would be constructed under the No Action alternative. If improvements to existing facilities are constructed, minor, actions to reduce soil erosion, and to identify, map, and reduce threats associated with landslides, would not be implemented as part of a comprehensive plan. Actions could be proposed that would reduce potential impacts, similar to those proposed under the preferred plan. • Public access would be less than under the preferred alternative. Therefore, potential seismic hazards would not be significant.</td>
<td>• Construction of facilities would result in similar potential for erosion and landslides as the preferred alternative. Because no golf course would be constructed, potential erosion effects of large-scale grading would be reduced compared to the preferred alternative. Actions to reduce impacts would be implemented. • Allowed public access would be similar to the preferred project, and would result in similar potential for exposure to geologic hazards. Actions to reduce seismic impacts would be implemented.</td>
<td>• Construction of fewer new facilities would result in less potential for erosion and landslides. • Public access would be less than under the preferred alternative. Therefore, potential seismic impacts would not be significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Construction of facilities and improvements could expose hazards. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.</td>
<td>• No new facilities would be constructed under the No Action alternative. If new facilities construction occurs, hazards could be exposed. Implementation of mitigation measures similar to those proposed under preferred alternative would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant.</td>
<td>• Construction of facilities would result in reduced potential for exposure to hazardous materials as the preferred alternative. Because no golf course would be constructed, potential hazardous materials exposure during grading would be reduced. Actions to reduce impacts would be implemented.</td>
<td>• Construction of fewer new facilities would result in less potential exposure to hazardous materials.</td>
<td>• Public access would be less than under the preferred alternative. Therefore, potential exposure to hazardous materials would not be significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased access could result in greater use, storage, and dumping of hazardous materials, but would not result in potentially significant impacts.</td>
<td>• Public access would be less than under the preferred alternative. Therefore, potential exposure to hazardous materials would be less than preferred alternative, and impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td>• Allowed public access would be similar as for the as preferred alternative, and would result in similar potential for exposure to hazardous materials. Because no golf course would be constructed, potential hazardous materials use, storage and risk of exposure would be less than the preferred alternative. Actions to reduce seismic impacts would be implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4-1 (continued)
COMPARISON OF MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrology, Floodplains and Water Quality</strong></td>
<td>• New facilities construction could result in water quality impacts. Actions to maintain and improve water quality during and after construction would be implemented. With these actions, impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No new facilities would be constructed under the No Action alternative. If new facilities are constructed, water quality impacts could occur. Watershed management would continue under existing policies and could reduce potential impacts, but the NRMP would not be implemented, and the benefits of that plan would not be realized. Actions could be proposed that would reduce impacts, similar to those proposed under the preferred alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public access would be less than under the preferred alternative, therefore potential water quality impacts would be reduced. Actions could be proposed that would reduce impacts, similar to those proposed under the preferred alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced construction of new facilities would result in less potential impacts to water quality than the preferred alternative. Because no golf course would be built, temporary or permanent realignment of several seasonal streams in the Western Flat would not occur. Elsewhere in the Park, actions to maintain and improve water quality would be implemented, similar to those proposed under the preferred alternative. However, level of effort required to reduce impacts would be less than under the preferred alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction of fewer new facilities would result in less potential impacts to water quality. New trails and staging areas would incorporate measures to reduce construction and operational impacts to less than significant. The NRMP would not be implemented, and the benefits of that plan for water quality would not be realized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public access would be less than under the preferred alternative. In particular, there would be fewer Park visitors in the Western Flat, and the temporary or permanent realignment of seasonal streams would not be required. Therefore, potential impacts to not be significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Land Use, Plans and Policies</strong></th>
<th>• Implementation of the preferred plan would not conflict with land use plans and policies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No changes in land use plans and policies would result from the No Action alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced public access and facilities would conflict with the purpose and objective of acquiring the Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Similar to the preferred plan, implementation of this alternative would not conflict with land use plans and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Similar to the preferred plan, implementation of this alternative would not conflict with land use plans and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced public access and facilities would conflict with the purpose and objective of acquiring the Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td>• Construction of new facilities would result in noise increases. However, impacts would be less than significant. • Increased public use would result in increased noise related to traffic and recreation use. However, impacts would be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services and Utilities</strong></td>
<td>• Construction of new facilities and improvement of existing facilities could result in potential utilities and public services impacts. Actions that reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level would be implemented. • Increased public access could result in potential utilities and public services impacts, including increased need for medical emergency and wildland fire response. Actions that reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level would be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation</strong></td>
<td>• Construction of new facilities would benefit recreation access and opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Circulation</strong></td>
<td>• Increased access could result in traffic safety hazards. Implementation of mitigation measures would be required that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Resources</strong></td>
<td>• New facilities and improvements would result in visual change. With the exception of the golf course, new facilities would blend with the existing facilities. Management actions to reduce visual impacts include design requirements for structures and landscaping. • Increased access could result in increased litter and facilities damage. Implementation of management actions would reduce impacts to less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth Inducement</strong></td>
<td>• Would not result in growth inducement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>