

# Part I INTRODUCTION TO FINAL EIR

---

## Introduction

Pursuant to the criteria, standards, and procedures of the CEQA (Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Section 15000, et seq.), a Draft EIR was prepared by the City of La Mesa for the proposed Collier Park Renovations Project Master Plan project. The Draft EIR was submitted to the California Office of Planning and Research (State Clearinghouse) and circulated for public review twice. An initial 45-day Draft EIR public review period began on January 24, 2013 and ended on March 11, 2013. The entire Draft EIR document was made available during this review period. A second 45-day Recirculated Draft EIR public review period began on November 20, 2014 and ended on January 5, 2015. During this time, only those sections of the Draft EIR that had been substantively revised since the previous Draft EIR public review period were recirculated for review and comment. During the Draft EIR public review periods, the document was reviewed by various state and local agencies, as well as by interested individuals and organizations. A total of 34 letters were received by the City. All written comments received by the City have been fully addressed in written responses. The public review comments are contained in Part III of the Final EIR. This Final EIR includes the following items as required in Section 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines:

- Revisions or clarifications to the Draft EIR
- Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR
- List of persons, organizations and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR
- Responses of the lead agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process, and
- Any other information considered pertinent by the lead agency

## Final EIR Organization

The Final EIR is organized in four parts: I) Introduction to the Final EIR, II) Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, III) Comments Received on the Draft EIR and Responses, and IV) Final EIR and Appendices. Each of these parts has its own purpose and serves to aid the reader in fully understanding the proposed project and its implications. A brief description of each part follows.

Part I, Introduction to the Final EIR, serves to explain the purpose of the Final EIR and familiarize the reader with the preparation and public review processes as well as to explain how the document can be

used to understand the project and its consequences. The Introduction also includes a section which provides Revisions or Clarifications to the Draft EIR.

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), included as Part II of the Final EIR, has been prepared in accordance with Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines. The State CEQA Guidelines require that a mitigation monitoring and reporting program be adopted upon certification of an EIR to ensure mitigation measures identified in the EIR are implemented.

The Comments Received on the Draft EIR and Responses section (Part III of the Final EIR) includes the letters received during the two Draft EIR public review periods along with the City's responses to each comment. The comments are reproduced with the responses in a side-by-side format.

The full text of the Final EIR and its appendices are included in Part IV. The Final EIR represents the final version of each Draft EIR chapter and incorporates revisions or clarifications resulting from comments received on the Draft EIR. As identified in the discussion below, the revisions or clarifications to the Draft EIR are presented in strike-out and underline format.

## Revisions or Clarifications to the Draft EIR

Based on City review and in response to comments received, some text published in the Revised Draft EIR has been revised. Changes to the wording of impact or mitigation statements and material added or deleted to the impact analyses and discussions are presented below with changes shown in underline and strikeout or in a descriptive form, so that the original and revised text may be compared. Changes presented here are by section, in their order within the Revised Draft EIR. Those sections where no content changes were made are not included. Minor editorial changes have been made to improve readability, correct typographical errors, etc. EIR text is indicted in *italics*. Any additions to the EIR listed in the following section are indicated as underlined text, and deletions are indicated as ~~strikeout~~ text. In the text of the Final EIR, text modifications are also indicated in strike-out and underline format, with a simple vertical line in the outside margin.

### Chapter 1, Executive Summary (also Chapter 8, Alternatives)

The following discussion provided in Chapter 1 (Executive Summary) and Chapter 8 (Alternatives) has been revised to include a recommendation that the restoration period for the Spring House be determined as part of the Historic Structure Report (see Final EIR pages 1-4 and 8-2):

*Spring House Restoration Alternative. This alternative would restore the contributing features of the Collier Park historic district, including the Spring House, drinking fountain, drainage channel and tennis court. The Spring House would be restored to accurately depict the form, features, and character of the building as it appeared during the period of significance ("restoration period"), which will be determined by the completion of a Historic Structure Report during the mothballing process. ~~time in which it was used as a bottling works ("restoration period").~~ This alternative would implement the same improvements to the Panhandle and History Hill areas as are identified for the proposed project, except it would not replace the tennis court or remove the drainage channel, and it would maintain the historic old growth trees. Improvements to the Collier Club House area would not be implemented under this alternative.*

The following discussion regarding the Spring House phase of the proposed project in Chapter 1 (Executive Summary) has been revised to include information regarding the Historic Structure Report.

Spring House. *The existing Spring House is located adjacent to the Panhandle area of Collier Park. As part of the proposed project, the City is proposing to mothball the existing building to protect it from weather and vandalism. Mothballing the Spring House would be done in accordance with the National Park Service's (NPS) Preservation Brief #31: Mothballing Historic Buildings. This preservation practice may be put into place when funds are not currently available to put a deteriorating structure into a useable condition. In accordance with NPS Preservation Brief #43, a Historic Structure Report would be completed for the Spring House which provides documentary, graphic, and physical information on the property's history and existing condition. Implementation of NPS Preservation Briefs #31 and #43 would ensure that the Spring House is adequately documented, stabilized, and mothballed until funds can be acquired to put the deteriorating structure into a usable condition. Section 4.3.2.2 provides greater detail on the process of documenting, mothballing and stabilizing the Spring House.*

## Chapter 4, Project Description

Section 4.3.2.2 (Spring House) of Chapter 4 (Project Description) has been revised to include a recommendation that the restoration period for Spring House be determined as part of the Historic Structure Report, describe the purpose of the Historic Structure Report and include information regarding the California Historical Building Code (see Final EIR page 4-8):

### 1) Documentation

- a) *Document the architectural and historical significance of the building with the preparation of a Historic Structure Report. The Historic Structure Report would be prepared in accordance with NPS Preservation Brief #43: The Preparation and Use of Historic Structure Reports and will identify the period of significance ("restoration period") for the Spring House.*
- b) *Prepare a condition assessment of the building*

### 2) Stabilization

- a) *Structurally stabilize the building, based on a professional condition assessment*
- b) *Exterminate or control pests, including termites and rodents*
- c) *Protect the exterior from moisture penetration*

### 3) Mothballing

- a) *Secure the building and its component features to reduce vandalism or break-ins*
- b) *Provide adequate ventilation to the interior*
- c) *Secure or modify utilities and mechanical systems*
- d) *Develop and implement a maintenance and monitoring plan for protection*

*In accordance with NPS Preservation Brief #31, implementation of the steps listed above would ensure that the Spring House is adequately documented, stabilized, and mothballed until funds can be acquired to put the deteriorating structure into a usable condition. Implementation of*

*the maintenance and monitoring plan (step # 3d) would ensure that the Spring House is routinely checked and protected from pests and/or break-ins.*

*In accordance with NPS Preservation Brief #43, a Historic Structure Report would be completed for the Spring House which provides documentary, graphic, and physical information on the property's history and existing condition. The Historic Structure Report is an effective part of the preservation planning process as it also addresses management and/or owner goals for the use or re-use of the property; provides the most appropriate approach to treatment; outlines scope of recommended work; and records the findings of research and investigation of the structure. The Historic Structure Report would be referred to once funds are acquired to restore or rehabilitate the Spring House.*

*Additionally, the existing Spring House building is structurally unstable due to damage and deterioration over time, which could present a significant hazard during strong seismic ground shaking. As a project design feature, the Spring House would include improvements to the building to meet structural requirements pursuant to the La Mesa Municipal Code Title 14 and the California Building Code to ensure that the building does not pose a safety hazard. Additionally, the preservation of the historical integrity of the Spring House would be achieved through compliance with the California Historical Building Code (Title 24, Chapter 8), which identifies alternative methods of meeting the requirements of the local structural and California Building Codes while still ensuring historical integrity.*

## **Chapter 5.4, Cultural Resources**

Section 5.4.4.1 (Historical Resources) of Chapter 5 (Cultural Resources) has been revised to include the evaluation of the Spring House in a Historic Structure Report (see Final EIR page 5.4-17):

*The proposed project includes development of undeveloped open space within the park (History Hill and Collier Club House areas), which would require the alteration of the natural terrain and the removal of old-growth trees and vegetation. The development of existing open space into an amphitheater and club house would transform the topography, vegetation, circulation, spatial organization and land pattern of the park, which are important contributing features of the Collier Park district. The City is proposing to mothball the Spring House for short-term preservation of the building until funds can be acquired to put the Spring House into a usable condition. In addition, a Historic Structure Report would be completed as part of the mothballing process to document the structure's history and existing physical condition and identify the period of significance ("restoration period") for the Spring House. Mothballing the Spring House would not alter its eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR and NRHP as a contributing element to the Collier Park historic district (ASM 2014).*

## **Chapter 8, Alternatives**

Section 8.2.3 (Spring House Restoration Alternative) in Chapter 8 (Alternatives) has been revised to include a recommendation that the restoration period be determined as part of the Historic Structure Report (see Final EIR page 8-10):

*The Spring House Restoration Alternative would restore the existing Spring House to accurately depict the form, features, and character of the building as it appeared during the period of*

*significance (“restoration period”), which will be determined by the completion of Historic Structure Report during the mothballing process. This will include the removal of ~~time in which it was used a bottling works (“restoration period”)~~ by removing features from other periods in its history and reconstructing missing features from the restoration period.*

This page intentionally left blank.