

V. ALTERNATIVES

# V. ALTERNATIVES

# A. INTRODUCTION

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

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

Direction regarding the definition of project alternatives is provided in the CEQA *Guidelines* as follows:

An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.<sup>1</sup>

CEQA Guidelines emphasize that the selection of project alternatives be based primarily on the ability to reduce impacts relative to the proposed project, "even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly."<sup>2</sup> The Guidelines further direct that the range of alternatives be guided by a "rule of reason," such that only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice are addressed.3

In selecting project alternatives for analysis, potential alternatives must pass a test of feasibility. CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(f)(1) states that:

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

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

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b).

CEOA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f).

V. Alternatives - Introduction March 2011

alternatives.<sup>4</sup> In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) requires that an EIR identify any alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and discuss the reasons for their rejection.

Of the various alternatives available for evaluation, the process of selecting project alternatives to be analyzed in this EIR included an identification of the significant effects associated with the Second+PCH project, a review of the basic objectives established for the project (outlined in Chapter II, *Project Description*, and in subsection V.A.2, below), and consideration of the land use plans applicable to the project site. Based on these factors, the alternatives that were selected for analysis include:

- No Project/No Development Alternative: The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that the Second+PCH project would not be constructed and development of the project site with new uses and structures would not occur.
- **No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative:** The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative assumes that the Second+PCH project would not be developed, but the project site would be redeveloped with commercial uses to the extent allowable under existing zoning.
- **Reduced Intensity Alternative A:** Reduced Intensity Alternative A would involve the development of a similar mix of land uses on the project site as the proposed project, but reduced in terms of commercial/retail and residential development intensity (20- and 15-percent, respectively), and this Alternative would not include the theater use that is included in the proposed project. Hotel, hotel restaurant, hotel meeting space, and marine science center uses, as well as public open space and maximum building heights, would be the same as under the proposed project, though non-hotel restaurant uses would be reduced by approximately five percent.
- **Reduced Intensity Alternative B:** Reduced Intensity Alternative B would involve the development of a similar mix of land uses on the project site as the proposed project, but reduced in terms of commercial/retail and residential development intensity (35- and 33-percent, respectively), and this Alternative would not include the theater use that is included in the proposed project. Hotel, hotel restaurant, hotel meeting space, and marine science center uses, as well as public open space, would be the same as under the proposed project, though non-hotel restaurant uses would be reduced by approximately five percent. However, under this Alternative, maximum building heights would be reduced by approximately 45 percent (i.e., from 12 to six stories, or from 150 feet to 82 feet).
- **Reduced Intensity Alternative C:** Reduced Intensity Alternative C would involve the development of a similar mix of land uses on the project site as the proposed project, but reduced in terms of commercial/retail and residential development intensity (40- and 70-percent, respectively), and this Alternative would not include the theater use that is included in the proposed project. Hotel, hotel restaurant, hotel meeting space, non-hotel restaurant, and marine science center uses, as well as public open space, would all be the same as under the proposed project. However, under this Alternative, maximum building heights would be reduced by a minimum of 45 percent (i.e., from 12 stories to fewer than six stories, or from 150 feet to less than 82 feet).
- **Reduced Intensity Alternative D:** Reduced Intensity Alternative D would involve the development of a comparable mix of land uses on the project site as the proposed project, but would be reduced in

Second+PCH Development **City of Long Beach** PCR Services Corporation/SCH No. 2009101014 V-2

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2).

March 2011 V. Alternatives - Introduction

terms of commercial/retail intensity (40-percent), would not include residential development, and would not include the theater use that is included in the proposed project. Hotel, hotel restaurant, hotel meeting space, non-hotel restaurant, and marine science center uses, as well as public open space, would all be the same as under the proposed project. However, under this Alternative, maximum building heights would be reduced by a minimum of 45 percent (i.e., from 12 stories to fewer than six stories, or from 150 feet to less than 82 feet).

Each of these alternatives is summarized below in **Table V-1**, *Summary of Project Alternatives*, and described in greater detail in Subsection V.B, below.

#### 2. OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The following set of objectives, which are discussed in more detail in Chapter II, *Project Description*, of this EIR, have been developed in consideration of goals and objectives of the project applicant and the City of Long Beach (City). These objectives have been considered in the development of the alternatives outlined above.

- Create a mixed-use project that includes residential condominiums, a full-service hotel, and a successful retail center on the site.
- Create an aesthetically attractive, high quality design that reflects the property's unique orientation adjacent to an active marina.
- Provide amenities that encourage and promote public access to the marina.
- Provide a high level of accessibility to and through the site to ensure a high-quality pedestrian environment, efficient vehicular access, including bicycle facilities, and access to mass transit.
- Provide an economically viable reuse of the project site that facilitates soil/groundwater remedial action plans, while minimizing adverse impacts to surrounding properties.
- Design and implement comprehensive site development standards that minimize adverse impacts to the environment.
- Enhance the economic vitality of the City and provide property tax, sales tax, and other revenue opportunities.
- Create a southeastern gateway to the City that is welcoming, iconic in nature, and visible from a distance.

V. Alternatives – Introduction March 2011

Table V-1
Summary of Project Alternatives

	Residential	Commercial/ Retail	Hotel	Hotel Restaurant	Restaurant	Science Center	Meeting Space	Theater	Public Open Space	BUILDING HEIGHT
Proposed Project	325 units	191,475 s.f.	100 rooms	4,368 s.f.	21,092 s.f.	4,175 s.f.	3,510 s.f.	99 seats	219,134 s.f.	150 feet (12 stories)
Alternative 1 - No Project/No Development	0 units	2,500 s.f.	240 rooms	2,800 s.f.	5,600 s.f.	0 s.f.	13,450 s.f.	0 seats	140,873 s.f.	35 feet (2 stories)
Alternative 2 - No Project/ Existing Zoning	0 units	646,000 s.f.	0 rooms	0 s.f.	0 s.f.	0 s.f.	0 s.f.	0 seats	142,833 s.f.	35 feet (2 stories)
Alternative 3 – Reduced Intensity Alternative A	275 units (15% Reduction)	155,000 s.f. (20% Reduction)	100 rooms	4,368 s.f.	20,000 s.f.	4,175 s.f.	3,510 s.f.	0 seats	219,134 s.f.	150 feet (12 stories)
Alternative 4 – Reduced Intensity Alternative B	215 units (33% Reduction)	125,000 s.f. (35% Reduction)	100 rooms	4,368 s.f.	20,000 s.f.	4,175 s.f.	3,510 s.f.	0 seats	219,134 s.f.	82 feet max. (6 stories)
Alternative 5 - Reduced Intensity Alternative C	100 units (70% Reduction)	115,000 s.f. (40% Reduction)	100 rooms	4,368 s.f.	21,092 s.f.	4,175 s.f.	3,510 s.f.	0 seats	219,134 s.f.	<82 feet (<6 stories)
Alternative 6 – Reduced Intensity Alternative D	0 units (100% Reduction)	115,000 s.f. (40% Reduction)	100 rooms	4,368 s.f.	21,092 s.f.	4,175 s.f.	3,510 s.f.	0 seats	219,134 s.f.	<82 feet (<6 stories)

s.f. = square feet

Source: PCR Services Corporation, 2011

March 2011 V. Alternatives – Introduction

#### 3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

In accordance with CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(c), an EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons for their rejection. According to the CEQA *Guidelines*, among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration are the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic project objectives (outlined above), the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. One alternative that has been considered and rejected as infeasible is summarized as follows:

Alternative locations distant from the project site: As discussed in more detail below, the project site is available for development because the project proponents own the land on which the project is proposed. The project applicant has thus proposed the Second+PCH project because the land is already in ownership and redevelopment of the site will enhance its value and achieve the other objectives expressed above. With this understanding, it is apparent that the applicant will not attempt to acquire another property on which to develop a project similar to that proposed on the project site. Developing a project like Second+PCH on any available property is not an objective of the applicant, while developing the proposed project on the project site is, because it will enhance the value of an existing asset. Therefore, alternative locations not already owned by the project proponents are not evaluated due to the current ownership of and asset in the property, and associated costs and constraints with acquisition that would impede timely and successful completion of the proposed project. Furthermore, it is an objective of the proposed project, and a key aspect of its design, to reflect and provide amenities that compliment and capitalize on adjacency with the Marina, and there are no known sites of sufficient size with such adjacency available to accommodate such development. Finally, development of the proposed project at an alternative location would be likely to result in similar impacts for most issues, and particularly for key issues such as traffic, air quality and noise.

#### 4. ANALYSIS FORMAT

In accordance with CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(d), each alternative is evaluated in sufficient detail to determine whether the overall environmental impacts would be fewer, similar, or greater than the corresponding impacts of the Second+PCH project. Furthermore, each alternative is evaluated to determine whether the project objectives, which are outlined above and in Chapter II, *Project Description*, will be substantially attained by the alternative. The evaluation of each of the alternatives follows the process described below:

- a. The net environmental impacts of the alternative after implementation of reasonable mitigation measures are determined for each environmental issue area analyzed in the EIR.
- b. Post-mitigation significant and non-significant environmental impacts of the alternative and the project are compared for each environmental issue area. Where the net impact of the alternative will be clearly less adverse or more beneficial than the impact of the project, the comparative impact is said to be "less." Where the alternative's net impact will be clearly more adverse or less beneficial than the project, the comparative impact is said to be "greater." Where the impacts of the alternative and the project will be roughly equivalent, the comparative impact is said to be "similar."

V. Alternatives – Introduction March 2011

c. The comparative analysis of the impacts is followed by a general discussion of whether the underlying purpose and basic project objectives are substantially attained by the alternative.

**Table V-2**, *Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives With Impacts of the Proposed Project*, on pages V-7 through V-13 provides a summary comparison of the impacts associated with each of the proposed alternatives with the impacts of the Second+PCH project.

March 2011 V. Alternatives -Introduction

Table V-2 **Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives** With Impacts of the Proposed Project

Issue Area	Proposed Project Impact	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2 No Project/ Existing Zoning	Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity Alternative A	Alternative 4 Reduced Intensity Alternative B	Alternative 5 Reduced Intensity Alternative C	Alternative 6 Reduced Intensity Alternative D
Aesthetics	110jeet iiipaet	Bevelopment	Existing Lonning	Atternative A	Atternative B	Alternative C	Aiternative B
Scenic Vistas/Views	Less Than Significant	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Aesthetics/Visual Quality	Less Than Significant	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Light/Glare	Less Than Significant	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Shade/Shadow	Less Than Significant	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Air Quality							
Regional Construction Emissions	Significant and Unavoidable	Less (No Impact)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)
Local Construction Emissions	Significant and Unavoidable	Less (No Impact)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)
Construction Toxic Air Contaminants	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
AQMP Consistency	Significant and Unavoidable	Less (No Impact)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)
Regional Operational Emissions	Significant and Unavoidable	Less (No Impact)	Greater (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)	Less (Significant and Unavoidable)
Local Operational Emissions	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)

V. Alternatives -Introduction March 2011

# Table V-2 (Continued)

# **Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives** With Impacts of the Proposed Second+PCH Project

	Proposed	Alternative 1 No Project/ No	Alternative 2 No Project/	Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity	Alternative 4 Reduced Intensity	Alternative 5 Reduced Intensity	Alternative 6 Reduced Intensity
Issue Area	Project Impact	Development	Existing Zoning	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Operational Toxic Air	Less Than	Less (No	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than
Contaminants	Significant	Impact)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Global Climate Change	Significant and	Less (No	Greater	Less	Less	Less	Less
	Unavoidable	Impact)	(Significant and	(Significant and	(Significant and	(Significant and	(Significant and
			Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)
Biological Resources							
Sensitive Species	Less Than	Less (No	Similar	Similar	Less	Less	Less
	Significant	Impact)	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than
			Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Riparian Habitat/Sensitive	Less Than	Less (No	Similar	Similar	Less	Less	Less
Natural Communities	Significant	Impact)	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than
			Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Federally Protected	Less Than	Less (No	Similar	Similar	Less	Less	Less
Wetlands	Significant	Impact)	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than
			Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Wildlife Movement	Less Than	Less (No	Less (Less Than	Similar	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than
	Significant	Impact)	Significant)	(Less Than	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
				Significant)			
Conflicts with Plans,	Less Than	Less (No	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Less (Less Than
Policies, Regulations	Significant With	Impact)	Than	Than	Than	Than	Significant With
Protecting Biological	Mitigation		Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Mitigation)
Resources			Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	
Cultural Resources							
Archaeological Resources	Less Than	Less (No	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less
	Significant With	Impact)	Than	Than	Than	Than	Than
	Mitigation		Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With
			Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)
Paleontological Resources	Less Than	Less (No	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less
	Significant With	Impact)	Than	Than	Than	Than	Than
	Mitigation		Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With
			Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)

March 2011 V. Alternatives -Introduction

# Table V-2 (Continued)

# **Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives** With Impacts of the Proposed Second+PCH Project

Issue Area	Proposed Project Impact	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2 No Project/ Existing Zoning	Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity Alternative A	Alternative 4 Reduced Intensity Alternative B	Alternative 5 Reduced Intensity Alternative C	Alternative 6 Reduced Intensity Alternative D
Native American	Less Than	Less (No	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less
Resources (Human	Significant With	Impact)	Than	Than	Than	Than	Than
Remains)	Mitigation		Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With
			Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)
Historic Resources	Less Than	Less (No	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Significant	Impact)	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than
			Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Geology and Soils							
Seismic Ground Shaking	Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than
	Significant	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Seismic-Related Ground	Less Than	Less (Less Than	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less
Failure, Including	Significant With	Significant)	Than	Than	Than	Than	Than
Liquefaction	Mitigation		Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With
			Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)
Soil Erosion/Loss of	Less Than	Less (No	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Topsoil	Significant	Impact)	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than
-			Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Landslide, Lateral	Less Than	Less (Less Than	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less
Spreading, Subsidence,	Significant With	Significant)	Than	Than	Than	Than	Than
Liquefaction, or Collapse	Mitigation		Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With
			Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)
Hazards and Hazardous Materi	als						
Transport and Disposal of	Less Than	Less (No	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Hazardous Materials	Significant	Impact)	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than
		• •	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Hazardous Materials	Less Than	Greater	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less	Similar (Less
Releases	Significant With	(Potentially	Than	Than	Than	Than	Than
	Mitigation	Significant)	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With
			Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)

V. Alternatives -Introduction March 2011

# Table V-2 (Continued)

# **Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives** With Impacts of the Proposed Second+PCH Project

	Proposed	Alternative 1 No Project/ No	Alternative 2 No Project/	Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity	Alternative 4 Reduced Intensity	Alternative 5 Reduced Intensity	Alternative 6 Reduced Intensity
Issue Area	Project Impact	Development	Existing Zoning	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Listed Hazardous	Less Than	Less (Less Than	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Materials Sites	Significant	Significant)	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than
			Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Hydrology and Water Quality							
Hydrology/Drainage	Less Than	Similar (Less	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Significant	Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than
		Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Floodplains	Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than
	Significant	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Construction Surface	Less Than	Less (No	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Water Quality	Significant	Impact)	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than
			Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Construction	Less Than	Less (No	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than
Groundwater Quality	Significant	Impact)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Operational Surface Water	Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than
Quality	Significant	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Operational Groundwater	Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than
Quality	Significant	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Land Use and Planning							
Consistency with Plans,	Significant and	Less (No	Less	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Policies and Regulations	Unavoidable	Impact)	(Significant and	(Significant and	(Significant and	(Significant and	(Significant and
			Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)
Noise							
Construction Noise	Less Than	Less (No	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than
	Significant With	Impact)	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With	Significant With
	Mitigation		Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)	Mitigation)
Construction Vibration	Less Than	Less (No	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than
	Significant	Impact)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Operational Stationary	Less Than	Less (No	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than
Source Noise	Significant	Impact)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)

March 2011 V. Alternatives -Introduction

# Table V-2 (Continued)

# **Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives** With Impacts of the Proposed Second+PCH Project

Issue Area	Proposed Project Impact	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2 No Project/ Existing Zoning	Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity Alternative A	Alternative 4 Reduced Intensity Alternative B	Alternative 5 Reduced Intensity Alternative C	Alternative 6 Reduced Intensity Alternative D
On-Site Operational Noise Effects	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less (No Impact)	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant With Mitigation)			
Off-Site Mobile Source Noise	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Operational Vibration	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Population and Housing							
Population Growth	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Police Protection	-		-				
Services and Facilities	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant With Mitigation)	Less (Less Than Significant With Mitigation)			
Fire Protection							
Services and Facilities	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Schools		•	<u> </u>		J		<u> </u>
Services and Facilities	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Parks and Recreation	J	• •	,	,	, ,	,	J
Services and Facilities	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Libraries							
Services and Facilities	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)

V. Alternatives -Introduction March 2011

# Table V-2 (Continued)

# **Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives** With Impacts of the Proposed Second+PCH Project

		Alternative 1		Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5	Alternative 6
		No Project/	Alternative 2	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced
	Proposed	No	No Project/	Intensity	Intensity	Intensity	Intensity
Issue Area	Project Impact	Development	Existing Zoning	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Traffic and Circulation							
Circulation System	Significant and	Less (No	Greater	Less	Less	Less	Less
Conflicts (Intersections)	Unavoidable	Impact)	(Significant and				
			Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)
CMP Facilities and Public	Significant and	Less (No	Greater	Less	Less	Less	Less
Transit	Unavoidable	Impact)	(Significant and				
			Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)	Unavoidable)
Safety Hazards/Design	Less Than	Less (No	Less (Less Than	Similar (Less	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than
(Site Circulation)	Significant With	Impact)	Significant)	Than	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
	Mitigation			Significant)			
Emergency Access	Less Than	Less (No	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Significant	Impact)	(Less Than				
			Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Parking Capacity	Less Than	Less (No	Less (Less Than				
	Significant	Impact)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Conflicts with Alternative	Less Than	Less (No	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Transportation	Significant	Impact)	(Less Than				
			Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Water							
Water Infrastructure	Less Than	Less (No	Less (Less Than				
	Significant	Impact)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Water Supply	Less Than	Less (No	Less (Less Than				
	Significant	Impact)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Wastewater							
Wastewater Treatment	Less Than	Less (No	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Requirements	Significant	Impact)	(Less Than				
-			Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
Wastewater Treatment	Less Than	Less (No	Less (Less Than				
Facilities/ Capacity	Significant	Impact)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)

March 2011 V. Alternatives -Introduction

# Table V-2 (Continued)

# **Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives** With Impacts of the Proposed Second+PCH Project

Issue Area	Proposed Project Impact	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2 No Project/ Existing Zoning	Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity Alternative A	Alternative 4 Reduced Intensity Alternative B	Alternative 5 Reduced Intensity Alternative C	Alternative 6 Reduced Intensity Alternative D
Solid Waste							
Landfill Capacity	Less Than	Less (No	Greater	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than	Less (Less Than
	Significant	Impact)	(Less Than	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)
	-		Significant)				
Conflicts with Solid Waste	Less Than	Less (No	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Regulations	Significant	Impact)	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than	(Less Than
	_		Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)	Significant)

Source: PCR Services Corporation, 2011

V. Alternatives -Introduction March 2011

Table V-2 (Continued)

**Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives** With Impacts of the Proposed Second+PCH Project

This page intentionally blank.

# **B. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS**

# **B.1. NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE**

#### 1. **DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE**

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, "the no project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions ..., as well as what would be 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."<sup>5</sup> The Guidelines continue to state that "in certain instances, the no project alternative means 'no build' wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained."6

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no physical changes to the project site would occur, and the existing on-site uses would continue to operate as they currently do. No improvements to the site would be performed, but the existing soil and groundwater remediation program associated with the former onsite 76 gas station would continue to be implemented under oversight of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

#### 2. **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CATEGORIES**

#### a. Aesthetics and Views

Since there would be no changes to the project site under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the existing viewshed of and from the project site would also be maintained. However, given the limited existing views of the Alamitos Bay Marina from Pacific Coast Highway (PCH), and the proposed project's views provided via Marina View Lane and the Great Space, impacts to views under this Alternative would be greater than under the proposed project but still less than significant.

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the visual quality of the site, which is considered poor, would be maintained with the existing two-story buildings in varying degrees of disrepair and an overall outdated design. The surface parking lots would also remain in their current state without enhanced landscaping elements, though a large portion of the project site is currently maintained as landscaped open space. As such, the project site would not be improved with a unified mixed-use development with enhanced architectural and extensive landscaping elements and therefore impacts would be greater than the proposed project in this regard but would remain less than significant.

In addition, there would not be any light/glare impacts associated with construction activities or light/glare impacts to the motorists on PCH, 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, and Marina Drive and to the residents of the Marina Pacifica residential community to the northwest of the site and Los Cerritos Wetlands. Finally, by maintaining the existing buildings on-site, this Alternative would not result in any shade or shadow impacts to the

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B).

surrounding uses, including the Marina Pacifica residential community and live-aboard residents within the Alamitos Bay Marina, though shade and shadow impacts would be less than significant under the proposed project. As this Alternative would not cause any change in lighting, glare, or shading impacts, impacts would be less under the No Project/No Development Alternative compared to the proposed project.

# b. Air Quality /Global Climate Change

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in changes to the existing air quality environment. Since no construction activities would occur on the site, this Alternative would not result in emissions associated with construction worker traffic, fugitive dust from demolition and excavation, or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Therefore, there would be no impact in regards to regional construction emissions, toxic air contaminants (TACs), or in regards to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during construction. While the proposed project would result in significant construction air quality impacts with regard to regional and localized impacts and GHG emissions, there would be no construction air quality or global climate change impacts under this Alternative. Similarly, this Alternative would not result in any impacts related to AQMP consistency, which would be significant under the proposed project. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts with regards to air quality and global climate change during construction.

With regard to operations, as the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in new development on the site, no new operational emissions related to the consumption of electricity and natural gas or vehicular traffic would occur. However, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not implement a number of land use policies that have direct and indirect positive air quality benefits by reducing vehicle trips through increasing the housing supply in close proximity to jobs, encouraging development that uses existing infrastructure, and/or locating a hotel near a entertainment, retail, recreational and restaurant uses. Nonetheless, since no new emissions would result from this Alternative, impacts would be less than under the proposed project in regards to local and regional air emissions during operations, as the project would result in significant unavoidable regional emissions impacts and less than significant local emissions impacts. This Alternative would not result in new TAC impacts, though the proposed project's impact in this regard would be less than significant, and therefore impacts would be less than the proposed project. Finally, since this Alternative would not result in any operational GHG emissions impacts, opposed to a significant unavoidable impact under the proposed project, impacts would also be less in this regard.

# c. Biological Resources

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in any physical changes to the project site or surrounding area. As such, no impacts to sensitive species, riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, federally protected wetlands, or wildlife movement would occur under this Alternative. Additionally, no physical impacts to on-site trees would occur, thereby precluding adverse impacts to street trees or migratory nesting birds. Therefore no impacts related to conflicts with plans, policies, or regulations protecting biological resources would occur. As such, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

#### d. Cultural Resources

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not involve excavation and/or grading activities. Therefore, this Alternative would avoid the potential impacts related to the discovery of unknown

City of Long Beach

Second+PCH Development

Second+PCH Development

archaeological, paleontological, or Native American resources, including human remains. Accordingly, impacts to archaeological, paleontological, and Native American resources associated with this Alternative would be less than under the proposed project.

Similarly, this Alternative would not require the demolition of the existing Seaport Marina Hotel. While this property is not considered a historical resource, the fact that demolition and removal of on-site structures would not occur under this Alternative would result in no impacts relative to historical resources either onor off-site. As such, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

# e. Geology and Soils

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in new development that would be subject to groundshaking as a result of seismic activity within the area. However, the existing buildings on-site are also subject to seismic groundshaking and could be subject to soil liquefaction, subsidence, and collapse (though there would be no potential for vibration-related ground subsidence to occur, as no construction activities would be carried out). Regardless, the No Project/No Development would result in fewer impacts in relation to seismic activity.

Since the No Project/No Development Alternative would not require excavation and grading activities, this Alternative would not result in impacts regarding soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. However, it should be noted that with compliance with applicable water quality regulations, these impacts under the proposed project would be reduced to a less than significant level. Regardless, since there would be no grading or excavation under this Alternative, impacts would be less than under the proposed project.

#### f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This Alternative would not result in excavations or earthwork on-site that could expose workers to hazardous materials known to exist in soil and groundwater beneath the project site, or result in the need for off-site transport and disposal of excavated hazardous materials. As such, no construction-related hazardous materials impacts would occur, as compared to potentially significant impacts under the proposed project. However, despite ongoing remediation efforts on-site under the oversight of the RWQCB, existing contamination from on-site hazardous materials storage and historic releases related to the historic use of the site for oil extraction and later as a gas station would continue to exist and may pose a risk to those working at the site or staying at the existing hotel. In addition, various Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) were identified in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and subsequent hazardous materials evaluations performed for the project site that could continue to pose a health risk to people staying or working at the hotel. As such, given the presence of hazardous materials known to exist on-site, and potential ongoing exposure of employees and hotel guests to such materials, impacts related to hazardous materials releases under this Alternative would be potentially significant and greater than the proposed project in this regard. Impacts related to listed hazardous materials sites pertain to the former onsite gas station and off-site Mobil station, which have resulted in the aforementioned soil and groundwater contamination at the project site. Given that the remediation process is ongoing for these sites, impacts would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

# g. Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, there would be no change in the amount of impervious surfaces that would increase the amount of stormwater to the existing storm drains serving the project site. However, it should be noted that the existing stormwater facilities are adequate to accommodate development under the proposed project. In addition, this Alternative would not include extensive landscaping throughout the development that would serve to retain a portion of stormwater on-site that would otherwise be conveyed to local storm drains, as would occur under the proposed project. Regardless, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in similar impacts with regard to hydrology and drainage, since it would not notably change the amount of surface water runoff.

According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the project site is located within Zone X, an area located outside the 100-year floodplain, or protected by levees from the 100-year flood. As such, given that site conditions would not change under this Alternative, the risk associated with floodplains in the project area would not be affected. As such, impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project given the reduced number of people located on-site under this Alternative that would be subject to potential flooding associated with 100-year storm events.

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, there would be no new impact to water quality or groundwater during construction activities. It should be noted, however, that with development of the proposed project, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels given compliance with applicable water quality regulations. Regardless, since there would be no impact under this Alternative, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts to water quality and groundwater during construction. Similarly, while compliance with applicable water quality regulations would reduce impacts to surface water quality during operations, there would be no impact under the No Project/No Development Alternative, resulting in fewer impacts compared to the project. Additionally, since groundwater remediation would continue to occur on-site under both this Alternative and the proposed project, impacts to groundwater quality would be similar to the proposed project in this regard. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer overall impacts to surface water quality and groundwater resources compared to the proposed project.

#### h. Land Use

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in any redevelopment of the project site, and the existing hotel and ancillary uses would continue to operate on-site. Since no physical or operational changes would occur under this Alternative, on-site uses would continue to be consistent with surrounding uses in terms of use and scale, and no amendments to the City's General Plan, Local Coastal Program (LCP), or Southeast Area Development and Improvement Plan (SEADIP) would be necessary. While this Alternative would not result in conflicts with applicable plans, policies, and regulations including the City's General Plan, Strategic Plan, and Municipal Code, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not support the goals regarding the activity center to the same extent as the project. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in a mixed-use project on the site that would contribute to the identity of the City's eastern gateway. Under the No Project/No Development Alternative the site would remain underutilized and would not have an overall beneficial effect on the City's quality of life consistent with the goals and objectives of the Land Use Element. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not enhance pedestrian activity in the area and would not enhance the connection of the site to the waterfront. Further, the No Project Alternative

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach V-18

would not support and contribute to recreational opportunities in the area. With regard to regional plans, this Alternative would not conflict with SCAG plans and policies, or other relevant plans affecting the project site. As such, although the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in any impacts related to land use, and therefore impacts would be less than the proposed project, this Alternative would not support the General Plan and Strategic Plan goals and objectives regarding managed growth and the development of an activity center to the same extent as would the proposed project.

#### i. Noise

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not require construction activities that would impact nearby sensitive receptors. As such, this Alternative would not result in new impacts to nearby residents and therefore construction-related noise impacts would be less than the proposed project. In addition, despite the fact that impacts regarding ground-borne vibration would be less than significant under the proposed project, this Alternative would result in no ground-borne vibration from construction activities. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in reduced noise and vibration impacts during construction.

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the existing buildings that contain hotel, restaurant, and other commercial uses would continue to result in on-site operational noise including vehicle travel, mechanical equipment (e.g., HVAC systems), and landscape maintenance activities. It should be noted that while development of the proposed project would result in a greater density of development on the project site, the project would be required to comply with Long Beach Municipal Code (LBMC) requirements ensuring that new on-site noise sources do not contribute to an increase in the ambient noise level. Regardless, since there would be a reduction of on-site operational equipment compared to the proposed project, stationary noise impacts would be less under this Alternative. New impacts related to on-site sensitive uses would not occur under this Alternative, whereas mitigation measures are required to reduce such impacts to less than significant levels under the proposed project. As such, impacts would be less than the proposed project in this regard. Off-site mobile source noise and operational vibration impacts would be substantially reduced under this Alternative, as no additional noise or vibration would occur relative to existing conditions.

# j. Population and Housing

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population in the City, the Gateway Cities subregion, or to the SCAG region. As such, this Alternative would not induce substantial population growth in the area. No new direct population growth impacts would occur and impacts would be less as compared with the proposed project.

Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would also not result in additional on-site employment or associated indirect population growth. Existing employment levels associated with the existing hotel and ancillary land uses would remain unaffected. Therefore, implementation of this Alternative would not induce substantial indirect population growth associated with employment, resulting in fewer impacts as compared to the proposed project. In addition, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in an increase in residential units or associated indirect population growth. Therefore, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts compared to the proposed project.

Second+PCH Development **City of Long Beach** V-19

#### k. Public Services

# (1) Police Protection

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not require construction activities and therefore would not require additional police protection during construction or result in impacts to emergency access, though under the proposed project mitigation is necessary to address response time effects of temporary lane closures. Development of this Alternative would also not result in a direct and indirect population increase of 1,386 residents under the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities since it would not result in an increase of approximately 71 additional crimes, as would occur under the proposed project. Finally, this Alternative would not result in additional traffic, which could impact emergency response times. Therefore, since there would be no impacts under this Alternative, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities compared to the proposed project.

#### (2) Fire Protection

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, since there would be no construction, there would be no increase in demand for fire protection during construction or any impacts to emergency access. In addition, there would not be an increase in residential, commercial, and hotel uses that would also require an increase demand for fire protection services. Emergency response and emergency access to the site would also be maintained, resulting in no impacts. Finally, the existing buildings already comply with fire flow requirements and would not require any new water supply or facilities to accommodate the increased fire flow. Therefore, since there would be no impacts to fire protection under the No Project/No Development Alternative, impacts would be less compared to the proposed project.

#### (3) Schools

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, there would be no increase in residential units and employment positions that would result in an increase of direct and indirect residents. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in an increase of 131 students to the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD), as would occur under the proposed project. Thus, no impacts to schools would occur under the No Project/No Development Alternative and impacts would be less when compared with the proposed project.

#### (4) Parks and Recreation

Since new development would not occur and the on-site population would not change under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the existing demand for parks and recreational facilities would not be affected. Thus, implementation of this Alternative would not cause existing ratios of developed parklands per resident to decrease within the City, nor would it affect any existing recreational facilities in the project vicinity. However, in contrast to the proposed project, new recreation and open space areas would not be introduced on the project site including 219,134 square feet of public open space under the proposed project. In addition, the bikepaths along Marina Drive would not be developed under this Alternative. Further, development of this Alternative would not provide additional funds in compliance with Chapter 18.18, *Park and Recreation Facilities Fee*, of the LBMC, which requires residential developments to contribute fees for parks and recreational facilities. Nonetheless, since this Alternative would not create any additional

demand for parks or recreational facilities, as would the proposed project, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts regarding parks and recreation.

#### (5) Libraries

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population and therefore, the demand for library facilities associated with the No Project/No Development Alternative would remain consistent with present levels. As the service population for libraries would not change, the number of library items per capita and the amount of library facility square footage per capita would also not be affected. Therefore, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to library services and facilities compared to the proposed project.

#### I. Traffic and Circulation

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, there would be a substantial decrease in the amount of traffic impacting the regional and local traffic system relative to the proposed project. The lack of new vehicle trips under this Alternative results in a proportionate reduction in impacts to local and regional intersections, such that mitigation is not required at affected locations, whereas improvements would be required under the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would result in no impacts to study area intersections (including congestion management plan [CMP] intersections). This Alternative would not result in impacts regarding site access and design-related safety hazards, and impacts therefore would be less than under the proposed project. Additionally, no impacts regarding emergency access to the site would occur, compared to less than significant impacts under the proposed project. The No Project/No Development Alternative would also result in decreased ridership of public transportation and would not require approval of a shared parking plan to ensure parking impacts remain below a level of significance, as existing surface parking would remain on-site to serve current uses. Additionally, this Alternative would not conflict with plans, policies, or programs regarding alternative transportation, and no impacts would occur, compared to less than significant impacts under the proposed project. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts to traffic and circulation.

# m. Utilities and Service Systems

#### (1) Water Supply

The existing water consumption levels would not be affected by implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative since new development would not be constructed and the occupied on-site floor area would not increase beyond the existing conditions. Therefore, there would be no increase in demand for water during construction activities as would occur under the proposed project. However, it should be noted that impacts to water supply during construction activities would be less than significant. In addition, this Alternative would maintain the existing water demand of approximately 12,500 gallons per day (gpd) or 14 acre-feet per year (AFY) as opposed to a total demand of 130,340 gpd (146 AFY) under the proposed project. Furthermore, this Alternative would not require any new connections or changes to the existing water treatment or distribution system serving the area. Since there would be no new impacts to water supply or treatment and distribution infrastructure under the No Project/No Development Alternative, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

#### (2) Wastewater

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, existing on-site wastewater generation would not be affected since new development would not be constructed and the occupied on-site floor area would not increase beyond the existing conditions. Therefore, there would be no construction-related demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment as would occur under the proposed project. However, it should be noted that impacts to wastewater facilities during construction activities would be less than significant. In addition, this Alternative would maintain the existing average daily wastewater conveyance and treatment demand of approximately 27,375 gallons per day (gpd) or 0.042 cubic feet per second (cfs) as opposed to a total of 111,448 gpd (0.173 cfs) under the proposed project. Furthermore, this Alternative would not require any new connections or changes to the existing wastewater conveyance and treatment system in the area. Since there would be no new impacts to wastewater conveyance or treatment infrastructure under the No Project/No Development Alternative, impacts would be less than the proposed project in this regard.

### (3) Solid Waste

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not require the demolition of the existing hotel buildings and construction of new structures resulting in a total of 322,626 tons of solid waste under the proposed project, which would impact Los Angeles County's (County) unclassified landfills. However, it should be noted that impacts to the County's unclassified landfills would be less than significant. In addition, this Alternative would continue to generate approximately 369 pounds of solid waste per day as opposed to 2,944 pounds of solid waste per day under the proposed project. Additionally, like the proposed project, this Alternative would not conflict with statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, since this Alternative would not result in impacts to the County's unclassified landfills and would not result in a net increase of solid waste going to the County's Class III landfills, the No Project/No Development Alternative would have fewer impacts compared to the proposed project.

## 3. IMPACT SUMMARY

A comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with the No Project/No Development Alternative with the environmental impacts anticipated under the proposed project is provided in Table V-2 on pages V-7 through V-13. Although many of the improvements and project elements proposed as part of the Second+PCH project would have beneficial effects, which would not occur under the No Project/No Development Alternative (refer to the discussion below), this Alternative would not result in new environmental impacts, with the exception of aesthetics (aesthetics/visual quality and views). However, the significant impacts related to air quality/global climate change (regional and local construction emissions, AQMP consistency, GHG impacts, and regional operational emissions) and traffic (intersections and CMP intersections) would be eliminated. This Alternative would also not require mitigation measures to reduce impacts regarding biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards/hazardous materials, noise, police protection, and construction-related traffic) to a less-than significant level. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in an overall reduced level of environmental impact as compared to the proposed project and all of the potentially significant impacts associated with the project would be avoided under this Alternative.

# 4. RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The No Project/No Development Alternative would maintain the existing conditions on the project site and no physical development would occur. Therefore, this Alternative would not create a mixed-use project that

City of Long Beach

Second+PCH Development

Second+PCH Development

includes residential condominiums, a full-service hotel, and a successful retail center on the site; create an aesthetically attractive, high quality design that reflects the property's unique orientation adjacent to an active marina; provide amenities that encourage and promote public access to the marina; provide a high level of accessibility to and through the site to ensure a high-quality pedestrian environment, efficient vehicular access, including bicycle facilities, and access to mass transit; provide an economically viable reuse of the project site that facilitates soil/groundwater remedial action plans, while minimizing adverse impacts to surrounding properties; design and implement comprehensive site development standards that minimize adverse impacts to the environment; enhance the economic vitality of the City and provide property tax, sales tax, and other revenue opportunities, or create a southeastern gateway to the City that is welcoming, iconic in nature, and visible from a distance. As such, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives. Refer to **Table V-3**, *Summary of Alternatives vs. Project Objectives*, on page V-83 for a summary of the extent to which this Alternative does or does not meet each of the project objectives identified for the proposed project.

This page intentionally blank.

# **B.2. NO PROJECT/EXISTING ZONING ALTERNATIVE**

#### 1. DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would consist of redevelopment of the project site with uses allowable under the current SEADIP zoning requirements. For the purposes of this Alternatives analysis, this development scenario is assumed to allow for the development of commercial uses on 70 percent of the site area with a maximum building height of 35 feet. As such, this Alternative would include development of up to approximately 323,000 square feet of building footprint at two stories in height, for a total development of approximately 646,000 square feet of commercial uses on-site, compared to the total development of 822,500 square feet under the proposed project. Under this development scenario, uses are assumed to include retail, restaurant, or office uses, with parking to be provided on-site via subterranean parking levels. Per existing SEADIP standards, 30 percent of the site would be improved as usable open space, which would not include any portion of building footprint, streets, sidewalks adjacent to streets, or parking lots. No project-related amenities, such as the proposed Marine Science Learning Center or California State University Long Beach (CSULB) Repertory Theater, would be provided under this Alternative, but the existing soil and groundwater remediation program associated with the former on-site 76 gas station would continue to be implemented under oversight of the Los Angeles RWOCB.

#### 2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

#### a. Aesthetics and Views

With respect to scenic vistas/views under this Alternative, conformance with existing SEADIP standards would limit development on-site to two stories and 70 percent of the total site area. As such, while the specific orientation and location of structures under this Alternative are not known, it is expected that development of new commercial uses on the site would provide for views through the site from various surrounding locations, similar to the proposed project. Given the lack of existing view corridors, and anticipated similarity in views afforded by this Alternative and the proposed project, view impacts are considered less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative, the visual quality of the site would be enhanced relative to existing conditions, given the current development on-site that consists of structures in various states of disrepair and outdated architecture and color scheme. While it is anticipated that implementation of this Alternative would result new, modern development on the project site, and would include usable open space on at least 30 percent of the site, and associated landscaping and design features. However, despite the overall improvement of the visual quality of the site under this Alternative, it is not anticipated that the associated improvements would be comparable to the extensive landscaping, approximately 46 percent of the site in open space, and the innovative design and mix of land uses under the proposed project. As such, visual quality impacts under this Alternative, while less than significant, would be greater than the proposed project.

Impacts regarding light and glare and shade/shadow under this Alternative would be less than significant based on the reduced development intensity, and building design and heights, relative to the proposed project. Therefore, although the proposed project would not have significant light and glare and

shade/shadow impacts, impacts under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative in this regard would be less than the proposed project.

# b. Air Quality/Global Climate Change

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in additional impacts to the existing air quality environment. Construction activities would occur on the site under this Alternative, but would not occur for as long a duration as the proposed project, and would result in emissions associated with construction worker traffic, fugitive dust from demolition and excavation, or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Therefore, there would be potentially significant impacts in regards to local and regional construction emissions and GHG emissions during construction, as well as AQMP consistency. Despite the shorter duration of construction activities under this Alternative, daily construction-related air pollutant emissions, like the proposed project, would result in significant unavoidable construction air quality impacts with regard to regional and localized impacts and GHG emissions, despite the implementation of applicable mitigation measures. However, as is the case with the proposed project, construction-related toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions would be less than significant. Therefore, although the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in significant unavoidable construction impacts, impacts would be less than the proposed project given the shorter duration of construction activities.

With regard to operations, as the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in new development on the site, and associated operational emissions related to the consumption of electricity and natural gas and vehicular traffic. Additionally, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would not implement a number of land use policies that have direct and indirect positive air quality benefits by reducing vehicle trips through increasing the housing supply in close proximity to jobs or locating a hotel near a entertainment, retail, recreational and restaurant uses. Furthermore, increased emissions would result from this Alternative given the substantial increase in traffic (see discussion below), and therefore impacts would be greater than under the proposed project in regards to local and regional air emissions during operations, and regional impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. This Alternative would result in new TAC impacts, but like the proposed project, impacts in this regard would be less than significant. Finally, this Alternative would result in significant and unavoidable GHG impacts even with implementation of applicable mitigation measures, as is the case with the proposed project, but impacts would be greater than the proposed project relative to GHG emissions given the substantial increase in traffic under this Alternative.

# c. Biological Resources

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in the redevelopment of the project site with commercial/retail uses to the maximum intensity allowable under existing zoning. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, given the developed nature of the project site, lack of notable resources on-site, and distance of the site from viable habitat areas, this Alternative would result in less than significant direct and indirect impacts to sensitive wildlife species, riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, and federally protected wetlands. Furthermore, it is anticipated that implementation of the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in the removal of many, if not all, of the existing trees on the project site (some of which may be street trees within the public right-of-way), as is the case with the proposed project. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would require mitigation to reduce impacts related to conflicts with plans, policies, and regulations protecting migratory nesting birds in the project area to less than significant levels. However, impacts associated with removal of street trees would be less than

City of Long Beach

PCR Services Comparision (CCLINIc 2000101114)

Second+PCH Development

significant, similar to the proposed project. Overall, impacts to biological resources under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be less than the proposed project.

#### d. Cultural Resources

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would involve excavation and grading for a subterranean parking structure, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would have comparable potential impacts related to the discovery of unknown paleontological, archaeological, or Native American resources (including human remains), and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Accordingly, impacts to archaeological, paleontological, and Native American resources associated with this Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

This Alternative would involve demolition of the existing Seaport Marina Hotel, which is not considered a historical resource, and would not have an adverse effect on any off-site listed historical resources in the project vicinity (e.g., Marine Stadium). Therefore, impacts to historical resources under this Alternative, similar to the proposed project, would be less than significant.

# e. Geology and Soils

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would redevelop the site with new commercial uses at a much higher intensity than exists on the site currently, and would also require substantial excavation for a subterranean parking level, as is the case with the proposed project. Given the decrease in development on-site relative to the proposed project, this Alternative would expose fewer people to risks associated with seismic ground shaking, since people working or shopping on-site would only do so during business hours, whereas the proposed project would include residential and hotel uses that would place people on-site 24 hours a day. Similarly, given the high liquefaction potential at the project site, this Alternative would expose people to secondary seismic risks due to seismic ground failure, including liquefaction, but to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Mitigation would still be required under this Alternative with regard to foundation design to address ground shaking and associated liquefaction hazards, but impacts in this regard would be less than the proposed project.

Since the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would require similar excavation and grading activities to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in comparable impacts regarding soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. However, as is the case with the proposed project, with compliance with applicable water quality regulations, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. As such, given the comparable amount of grading and excavation under this Alternative, impacts in this regard would be similar to the proposed project and less than significant.

Effects related to landslides, lateral spreading, and collapse would be similar to the proposed project, as no impacts would occur. Impacts related to subsidence would be comparable to those under the proposed project, as foundations would also require the use of pile driving, which can cause vibration-related subsidence, and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Overall, the geology and soils impacts of Alternative 2 would be similar to the proposed project.

#### f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This Alternative would require remediation of existing contamination and other RECs prior to redevelopment of the site, though perhaps to a lesser extent than the proposed project given the lack of residential uses, at the discretion of affected regulatory agencies. In any case, ongoing remediation of groundwater beneath the former on-site gasoline station would continue to occur pending closure of the case by the RWQCB. It is anticipated that the mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project would also be required for implementation of this Alternative, and therefore impacts would be similar to the proposed project and less than significant with mitigation. Impacts related to listed hazardous materials sites pertain to the former on-site gas station and off-site Mobil station, which have resulted in the aforementioned soil and groundwater contamination at the project site. Given that the remediation process is ongoing for these sites, impacts would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

# g. Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative, there would be a comparable change in the amount of impervious surfaces that would incrementally increase the amount of stormwater to the City storm drains serving the project site. However, it should be noted that the existing stormwater facilities are adequate to accommodate development under the proposed project. In addition, this Alternative would also include extensive landscaping throughout the development that would serve to retain a portion of stormwater onsite that would otherwise be conveyed to local storm drains, as would occur under the proposed project. Regardless, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in similar impacts with regard to hydrology and drainage, since it would not notably change the amount of surface water runoff.

According to the FIRM provided by FEMA, the project site is located within Zone X, an area located outside the 100-year floodplain, or protected by levees from the 100-year flood. As such, given that this Alternative would increase development intensity relative to existing conditions, the risk associated with floodplains in the project area would also be incrementally increased, though not to the extent that it would under the proposed project. As such, impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project given the reduced number of people located on-site under this Alternative that would be subject to potential flooding associated with 100-year storm events.

Under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative, there would be potential impacts to water quality or groundwater during construction activities, as is the case with the proposed project. It should be noted, however, that with development of the proposed project, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels given compliance with applicable water quality regulations. Similarly, while compliance with applicable water quality regulations would reduce impacts to water quality and groundwater during operations, there would be fewer impacts under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative, since the intensity of development that would generate pollutants would be incrementally reduced compared to the proposed project. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in fewer impacts to surface water quality, groundwater resources, and groundwater quality compared to the proposed project.

#### h. Land Use

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in the redevelopment of an underutilized site in a manner that would not require any amendments to City's General Plan, SEADIP, and Local Coastal Program. The uses and intensity of development under this Alternative would be consistent with development in the

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach PCR Services Corporation/SCH No. 2009101014 V-28

area. However, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would not support the Land Use Element goals and objectives regarding the creation of an activity center to the same extent as the project. This Alternative would not provide the range of uses on the site as proposed with the project and thus, would not contribute to the activity center to the same extent as the project. In addition, while this Alternative would contribute to the pedestrian activity in the area it would not be to the same extent as the project due to the limited range of uses. With regard to regional plans, this Alternative would not conflict with SCAG plans and policies, or other relevant plans affecting the project site. As such, this Alternative would not result in any impacts related to consistency with applicable plans, policies, or regulations affecting the project site. In addition, this Alternative would be compatible in terms of uses and scale with the surrounding development. However, this Alternative would generate nearly three times the vehicle trips as the proposed project, and therefore would result in significant unavoidable impacts related to project development intensity, including traffic and air quality/global climate change impacts, which would be greater than under the proposed project. Further, this Alternative would not support the General Plan and Strategic Plan goals and objectives regarding managed growth and the development of an activity center to the same extent as would the project. Specifically, relative to the proposed project, this Alternative would not achieve the following goals or policies to the extent the proposed project would: maintain or improve the current ability to move people and goods to and from activity centers while reinforcing the quality of life in the neighborhoods; permit sufficient employment and residential densities along transit routes to encourage transit ridership; increase the amount and quality of moderate and higher density housing along selected corridors; reinforce local mobility goals by reducing peak-hour traffic congestion; and ensure that all new development is designed and constructed to facilitate and encourage travel by carpool, vanpool, transit, bicycle, and foot. Overall, however, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts with respect to land use and planning relative to the proposed project.

#### i. Noise

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in construction activities comparable in intensity to the proposed project on a daily basis, but for a shorter duration given the lower overall amount of development. Therefore, noise and vibration impacts from construction activities would be less than significant given the lack of nearby sensitive receptors, and less than the proposed project based on a shorter construction schedule; however, mitigation measures for construction noise (pile driving) would still be required. With regard to operational impacts, stationary source noise impacts would be incrementally reduced compared to the proposed project, given the overall reduction in development intensity, and no impacts to on-site sensitive receptors would result since no residential or hotel uses would be located on-site under this Alternative. However, given the substantial increase in traffic under this Alternative, off-site mobile-source noise impacts would be greater than the proposed project, though impacts would remain less than significant. Additionally, although this Alternative would generate considerably more traffic than the proposed project, operational vibration would not be substantial in light of existing traffic levels in the area, and therefore would be similar to the proposed project and less than significant.

## j. Population and Housing

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in an indirect increase in population in the City, the Gateway Cities subregion, and the SCAG region. Development of this Alternative would not result in a direct population increase, as no residential units are proposed under this scenario. The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would, however, result in an indirect population increase of 1,106 persons, compared to

City of Long Beach

Second+PCH Development

Second+PCH Development

the total population of 1,386 under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in fewer population impacts compared to the proposed project and impacts would be less than significant.

Implementation of the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would also result in additional on-site employment. This Alternative would result in 1,525 total employment positions compared to 613 under the proposed project. Accounting for the existing estimated employment on-site, this represents an increase in employment positions of 1,359 under this Alternative and 447 under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a much larger increase in employment positions and associated indirect population growth compared to the proposed project, resulting in increased impacts in this regard, which would be less than significant. Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in development of new residential units, compared to 325 units under the proposed project, and associated population growth. As such, impacts regarding housing-related indirect population growth would less than significant and less than the proposed project under this Alternative.

#### k. Public Services

#### (1) Police Protection

Impacts regarding police protection and emergency access would be reduced during construction due to the reduced construction time period under this Alternative, though mitigation would still be required to address response time effects of temporary lane closures during construction. In addition, as described above, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in a total indirect population increase of 1,106 persons compared to 1,386 persons under the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities since it would only result in an increase of approximately 56 crimes per year compared to the 71 under the proposed project. Finally, this Alternative would result in a reduction of traffic compared to the proposed project, which could impact emergency response times. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities compared to the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.

#### (2) Fire Protection

Under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative, the demand for fire protection during construction and any impacts to emergency access would be reduced since the construction time period would be shorter compared to the proposed project. In addition, there would be a decrease in demand for fire protection services due to the decrease in the residential, commercial, and hotel uses that would be developed under this Alternative compared to the proposed project. Specifically, with a population increase of 1,106 persons under this Alternative, approximately 136 incidents per year would be expected to occur, compared to 170 incidents under the proposed project. Finally, similar to the proposed project, adequate emergency vehicle access would be ensured through site plan review by the LBFD, and similarly, the buildings would be required to comply with fire flow requirements but would have a reduced impact to water supply or facilities to accommodate the fire flow. Therefore, impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant and reduced compared to the proposed project.

# (3) Schools

Under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative, compared to existing conditions, the net increase of 1,359 employment positions would result in an indirect increase 1,106 City residents. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in an increase of 22 students to the LBUSD compared to 131 students under the proposed project. Thus, impacts to the LBUSD would be less when compared with the proposed project, and would be less than significant.

#### (4) Parks and Recreation

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would not include any residential uses or associated recreational facilities, but would be required to provide usable open space on a minimum of 30 percent of the 10.93-acre project site. As such, this Alternative would provide approximately 143,000 square feet of open space, compared to 219,134 square feet under the proposed project. However, given the lack of residential uses, this Alternative would not be required to provide park land or recreational facilities, and would not be subject to Chapter 18.18, Park and Recreation Facilities Fee, of the LBMC. Therefore, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts regarding parks and recreation compared to the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.

# (5) Libraries

As described above, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in an indirect increase in population of a total of 1,106 persons relative to the proposed project's increase of 1,386 persons. Therefore, this Alternative would also require an increase of library items and library square footage to maintain the existing services and facilities per capita, as is the case with the proposed project. However, since the total population impacting the library services and facilities would be reduced compared to the proposed project, impacts would also be less than significant. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to library services and facilities compared to the proposed project.

#### I. Traffic and Circulation

Under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative, there would be a substantial increase in the amount of traffic impacting the regional and local roadways relative to the proposed project. As shown in Table 15-1 in the project's Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix K of this EIR), the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would generate a total of 18,819 daily weekday vehicle trips and 25,060 daily weekend vehicle trips, which represents an increase of 7,529 weekday daily trips, 37 A.M. weekday peak hour trips, 754 P.M. weekday peak hour trips, 10,711 Saturday daily trips, and 920 Saturday Midday peak hour trips than the proposed project. Given these results, it can be qualitatively concluded that the traffic impacts associated with Alternative 2 (No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative) would be much greater than those identified previously for the proposed Project As such, despite the overall reduction in development square footage under this Alternative, development of the entire site with commercial/retail uses results in a near doubling of average daily weekday and weekend vehicle trips and associated impacts to local and regional intersections. Although mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts at affected locations, impacts to intersections would remain significant (e.g., 2<sup>nd</sup> Street at PCH and Studebaker at 2<sup>nd</sup> Street). As such, this Alternative would result in greater impacts to study area intersections (including CMP intersections) relative to the proposed project. Further, despite the increase in traffic, this Alternative would have less than significant impacts regarding site access given compliance with City site design requirements, and therefore impacts regarding safety hazards and internal circulation would be similar to the proposed project. Similarly,

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach V-31

emergency access would be provided per applicable requirements, as is the case with the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant. The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would also result in increased ridership of public transportation given the increase in daily vehicle trips associated with retail uses (which is the basis for calculating transit ridership). However, this Alternative would not require approval of a shared parking plan to ensure parking impacts remain below a level of significance, as a subterranean parking structure would be constructed with parking capacity to meet the City's Parking Code requirements, unlike the proposed project. This Alternative, like the proposed project, would also not conflict with plans or programs related to alternative transportation, or adversely affect alternative transportation facilities, and impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the No Project/ Existing Zoning Alternative would result in greater impacts to traffic and circulation.

# m. Utilities and Service Systems

#### (1) Water Supply

Proposed development under this Alternative would result in the development of up to 646,000 square feet of commercial development. As such, the projected water demand associated with the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be 129,200 gpd or 144.72 AFY, compared to 133,240 gpd or 149.25 AFY under the proposed project. While redevelopment of the project site under this Alternative would require new connections and improvements to water distribution infrastructure, it would likely require fewer improvements than the proposed project given the relatively low building heights and types of uses. Similar to the proposed project, construction-related water use would be limited and temporary and therefore impacts would be less than significant. As such, since the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in less water demand and fewer distribution infrastructure improvements, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

#### (2) Wastewater

Under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative, construction activities would occur on-site similar to under the proposed project, though it is expected that the duration of construction activities would be shorter given the lower overall development intensity. As such, construction-related wastewater impacts would be similar to the proposed project, as wastewater generation during construction is anticipated to be negligible relative to project operations, and impacts would be less than significant. Operation of this Alternative would result in an average of 51,680 gpd (0.08 cfs) of wastewater generation, compared to a total of 111,448 gpd (0.173 cfs) under the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would result in less demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment, and therefore impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project.

#### (3) Solid Waste

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would require the demolition of the existing hotel buildings and construction of new structures resulting in a total of 332,141 tons of solid waste, slightly less than the proposed project, which would impact the County's unclassified landfills. However, it should be noted that impacts to the County's unclassified landfills would be less than significant with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. In addition, this Alternative would generate approximately 3,230 pounds of solid waste per day during project operation, as opposed to 2,944 pounds of solid waste per day under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in greater impacts relative to the proposed project as it would result in a net increase of solid waste going to the County's Class III landfills,

City of Long Beach

Second+PCH Development

Second+PCH Development

though impacts would be less than significant. However, as with the proposed project, mitigation would be provided to reduce impacts to the maximum extent possible. Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would comply with all applicable programs and policies related to solid waste. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would have greater overall solid waste impacts compared to the proposed project.

#### 3. IMPACT SUMMARY

A comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative with the environmental impacts anticipated under the proposed project is provided in Table V-2 on pages V-7 through V-13. The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in less impacts to aesthetics (light/glare and shade/shadow), air quality/global climate change (construction emissions, toxic air contaminants, and AQMP consistency), biological resources (wildlife movement), geology and soils (seismic groundshaking and liquefaction/ground failure), hydrology and water quality (floodplains, construction water quality, and operational water quality), land use, noise (construction noise and vibration, operational stationary source noise, and on-site operational noise, though mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts to less than significant), population and housing, police protection, fire protection, schools, libraries, parks and recreation, traffic and circulation (parking capacity), water, and wastewater (wastewater treatment capacity). In addition, this Alternative would reduce the significant air quality impacts during construction; however, construction-related and operational air quality impacts, as well as traffic impacts, would remain significant under this Alternative. It should also be noted that impacts would be similar to the proposed project regarding scenic vistas/views, biological resources (sensitive species, riparian habitats/sensitive natural communities, federally protected wetlands, and conflicts with plans and policies protecting biological resources), cultural resources (archaeological, paleontological, Native American [including human remains], and historic resources, all of which except historic resources would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), geology and soils (soil erosion/loss of topsoil and lateral spreading, subsidence, and collapse), hazards and hazardous materials (which would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), hydrology and water quality (flooding/drainage and construction surface water quality), noise (operational vibration), traffic and circulation (site circulation, emergency access, and conflicts with alternative transportation), wastewater (wastewater treatment requirements), and solid waste (conflicts with solid waste regulations). However, this Alternative would result in greater impacts in regards to aesthetics/visual quality, air quality/global climate change (operational mobile-source emissions and global climate change), noise (off-site mobile-source noise), traffic and circulation (intersections and CMP facilities [intersections]), and solid waste (landfill capacity).

#### 4. RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative, only some of the project objectives would be fulfilled. First, this Alternative would not create a mixed-use project that includes residential condominiums, a full-service hotel, and a successful retail center on the site. While it would create an aesthetically attractive, high quality design, it would not take advantage of to nearly the same degree, the property's unique orientation adjacent to an active marina, or the opportunity to create a distinct gateway to the City. Similarly, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would not provide amenities that encourage and promote public access to the marina, or provide a high level of accessibility to and through the site to ensure a high-quality pedestrian environment, efficient vehicular access, including bicycle facilities, and access to mass transit.

While this Alternative would provide an economically viable reuse of the project site that facilitates soil/groundwater remedial action plans, while minimizing adverse impacts to surrounding properties, it would not be required to design and implement comprehensive site development standards that minimize adverse impacts to the environment since the development would only need to comply with existing zoning and associated development standards. Additionally, this Alternative would enhance the economic vitality of the City and provide property tax, sales tax, and other revenue opportunities by replacing the aging Seaport Marina Hotel that currently exists on-site. Finally, this Alternative would not create a southeastern gateway to the City that is welcoming, iconic in nature, and visible from a distance. Overall, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would partially or fully meet some of the project objectives. Refer to Table V-3 on page V-83 for a summary of the extent to which this Alternative does or does not meet each of the project objectives identified for the proposed project.

Second+PCH Development **City of Long Beach** V-34

# **B.3. REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE A**

#### 1. DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE

Alternative 3, Reduced Intensity Alternative A, would consist of redevelopment of the project site with a similar mix of land uses as the proposed project, but reduced in terms of commercial/retail and residential development intensity (20- and 15-percent, respectively), and this Alternative would not include the theater use that is included in the proposed project. Hotel, hotel restaurant, hotel meeting space, and marine science center uses, as well as public open space and maximum building heights, would be the same as under the proposed project, though non-hotel restaurant uses would be reduced by approximately five percent. Accordingly, this Alternative would include up to 275 residential units, 155,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses, 100 hotel rooms, 4,368 square feet of hotel restaurant space, 20,000 square feet of restaurant uses, a 4,175-square-foot science center, 3,510 square feet of hotel meeting space, 219,134 square feet of public open space, and building heights would generally range from three to six stories in height (i.e., up to 82 feet) with one residential tower reaching a maximum height of 12 stories (150 feet). Under this Alternative, project-related open space, landscaping, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be provided to serve the development, as is the case under the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the existing soil and groundwater remediation program associated with the former on-site 76 gas station would continue to be implemented under oversight of the Los Angeles RWQCB.

#### 2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

#### a. Aesthetics and Views

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative A, the development footprint, architectural design, and landscaping features of the development would be similar to the proposed project, with reduced intensity and similar building heights throughout the site (i.e., up to 150 feet with rooftop features). As such, views across the site from PCH would be provided via the Great Space and Marina View Lane, as is the case with the proposed project, and would be enhanced relative to existing conditions. Similarly, site improvements would be comparable to the proposed project and would greatly improve the visual quality of the site compared to existing conditions. The lower intensity of development would result in reduced light generation and less potential for glare effects, and the similar overall building heights would result in similar shading effects as the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to aesthetics, views, light and glare, and shade and shadow would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

# b. Air Quality/Global Climate Change

Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in additional impacts to the existing air quality environment. Construction activities would occur on the site under this Alternative, but would not occur for as long a duration as the proposed project, and would result in emissions associated with construction worker traffic, fugitive dust from demolition and excavation, or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Therefore, there would be potentially significant impacts in regards to local and regional construction emissions and GHG emissions during construction. Despite the shorter duration of construction activities under this Alternative, daily construction-related air pollutant emissions, like the proposed project, would result in significant unavoidable construction air quality impacts with regard to regional and localized impacts and GHG emissions, even with the implementation of applicable mitigation measures. Therefore, although

Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in significant unavoidable construction impacts, impacts would be less than the proposed project given the shorter duration of construction activities.

With regard to operations, as Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in new development on the site, and associated operational emissions related to the consumption of electricity and natural gas and vehicular traffic. However, like the proposed project, Reduced Intensity Alternative A would implement a number of land use policies that have direct and indirect positive air quality benefits by reducing vehicle trips through increasing the housing supply in close proximity to jobs or locating a hotel near a entertainment, retail, recreational and restaurant uses, though to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Nonetheless, although new emissions would result from this Alternative, impacts would be less than under the proposed project in regards to local and regional air emissions during operations, though impacts would remain significant even with mitigation. This Alternative would result in new TAC impacts, but like the proposed project, impact in this regard would be less than significant. Finally, this Alternative would result in significant GHG impacts even with implementation of applicable mitigation measures, though impacts would be less than the proposed project given the incremental reduction in intensity of uses.

# c. Biological Resources

Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in the redevelopment of the project site with a similar mix of uses as the proposed project, though reduced in terms of residential and commercial/retail intensity. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, given the developed nature of the project site, lack of notable resources on-site, and distance of the site from viable habitat areas, this Alternative would result in less than significant direct and indirect impacts to sensitive wildlife species, riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, and federally protected wetlands. Furthermore, it is anticipated that implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in the removal of many, if not all, of the existing trees on the project site (some of which may be street trees within the public right-of-way), as is the case with the proposed project. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would require mitigation to reduce impacts related to conflicts with plans, policies, and regulations protecting migratory nesting birds in the project area to less than significant levels. However, impacts associated with removal of street trees would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project. Based on a maximum building height of 150 feet under this Alternative, impacts to wildlife movement, including obstructions to bird flight paths, would be similar to the proposed project, but would be less than significant given similar project design features implemented under this Alternative. Overall, despite the incremental reduction in development intensity, impacts to biological resources under this Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

#### d. Cultural Resources

Reduced Intensity Alternative A would involve excavation and grading for a subterranean parking structure, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would have comparable potential impacts related to the discovery of unknown paleontological, archaeological, or Native American resources, and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Accordingly, impacts to archaeological, paleontological, and Native American resources associated with this Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

This Alternative would involve demolition of the existing Seaport Marina Hotel, which is not considered a historical resource, and would not have an adverse effect on any off-site listed historical resources in the

Second+PCH Development **City of Long Beach** V-36

project vicinity (e.g., Marine Stadium). Therefore, impacts to historical resources under this Alternative, similar to the proposed project, would be less than significant.

# e. Geology and Soils

Reduced Intensity Alternative A would redevelop the site with new residential, commercial, and hotel uses at a much higher intensity than exists on the site currently, and would also require substantial excavation for a subterranean parking level, as is the case with the proposed project. Given the decrease in development on-site relative to the proposed project, this Alternative would expose fewer people to risks associated with seismic ground shaking. Similarly, given the high liquefaction potential at the project site, this Alternative would expose people to secondary seismic risks due to seismic ground failure, including liquefaction, but to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Mitigation would still be required under this Alternative with regard to foundation design to address ground shaking and associated liquefaction hazards, but impacts in this regard would be less than the proposed project.

Since Reduced Intensity Alternative A would require similar excavation and grading activities to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in comparable impacts regarding soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. However, as is the case with the proposed project, with compliance with applicable water quality regulations, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. As such, given the comparable amount of grading and excavation under this Alternative, impacts in this regard would be similar to the proposed project and less than significant.

Effects related to landslides, lateral spreading, and collapse would be similar to the proposed project, as no impacts would occur. Impacts related to subsidence would be comparable to those under the proposed project, as foundations would also require the use of pile driving, which can cause vibration-related subsidence, and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Overall, the geology and soils impacts of Reduced Intensity Alternative A would be similar to the proposed project.

### f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This Alternative would require remediation of existing contamination and other RECs prior to redevelopment of the site, similar to the proposed project. Also like the proposed project, ongoing remediation of groundwater beneath the former on-site gasoline station would continue to occur pending closure of the case by the RWQCB. It is anticipated that the mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project would also be required for implementation of this Alternative, and therefore impacts would be less than significant with mitigation and similar to the proposed project. Since contamination associated with sites listed in government database records are the subject of the remedial activities being performed at the site, impacts related to listed hazardous materials sites would also be less than significant, as is the case with the proposed project.

# g. Hydrology and Water Quality

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative A, there would be a comparable change in the amount of impervious surfaces that would incrementally increase the amount of stormwater to the City storm drains serving the

However, it should be noted that the existing stormwater facilities are adequate to project site. accommodate development under the proposed project. In addition, this Alternative would also include extensive landscaping throughout the development that would serve to retain a portion of stormwater onsite that would otherwise be conveyed to local storm drains, as would occur under the proposed project. Regardless, Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in similar impacts with regard to hydrology and drainage, since it would not notably change the amount of surface water runoff.

According to the FIRM provided by FEMA, the project site is located within Zone X, an area located outside the 100-year floodplain, or protected by levees from the 100-year flood. As such, given that this Alternative would increase development intensity relative to existing conditions, the risk associated with floodplains in the project area would also be incrementally increased, though not to the extent that it would under the proposed project. As such, impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project given the reduced number of people located on-site under this Alternative that would be subject to potential flooding associated with 100-year storm events.

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative A, there would be potential impacts to water quality or groundwater during construction activities, as is the case with the proposed project. It should be noted, however, that with development of the proposed project, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels given compliance with applicable water quality regulations. Similarly, while compliance with applicable water quality regulations would reduce impacts to water quality and groundwater during operations, there would be fewer impacts under Reduced Intensity Alternative A, since the intensity of development that would generate pollutants would be incrementally reduced compared to the proposed project. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in fewer impacts to surface water quality, groundwater resources, and groundwater quality compared to the proposed project.

### h. Land Use

Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in a similar mix of land uses as the proposed project, but would be reduced in terms of residential and commercial/retail development intensity. As such, as with the proposed project, impacts related to compatibility of use would be less than significant, but impacts related to intensity and scale would be significant given the comparable building heights and significant traffic and air quality impacts (which would be incrementally reduced relative to the proposed project). While reduced in terms of overall intensity, this Alternative would still require amendments to the City's General Plan, SEADIP, and Local Coastal Program relative to uses and intensity of development, including building heights. Reduced Intensity Alternative A would contribute to the identity of the project area, but not to the same extent as the proposed project. For example, while Reduced Intensity Alternative A would include projectrelated amenities such as the Marine Science Learning Center and cycling center, it would not include the CSULB Repertory Theater. Thus, Reduced Intensity Alternative A would not support the Land Use Element goal regarding art and culture to the same extent as would the project. Similar to the project, Reduced Intensity Alternative A would enhance pedestrian activity in the area and would enhance the connection of the site to the waterfront. With regard to regional plans, this Alternative would not conflict with SCAG plans and policies, or other relevant plans affecting the project site. As such, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in significant impacts related to consistency with applicable plans, policies, or regulations affecting the project site. Therefore, overall, this Alternative would result in similar impacts with respect to land use and planning relative to the proposed project.

Second+PCH Development **City of Long Beach** V-38

#### i. Noise

Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in construction activities comparable in intensity to the proposed project on a daily basis, but for a shorter duration given the lower overall amount of development. Therefore, noise and vibration impacts from construction activities would be less than significant given the lack of nearby sensitive receptors, and less than the proposed project based on a shorter construction schedule, though mitigation measures would still be necessary to reduce construction noise impacts (pile driving) to less than significant levels. With regard to operational impacts, stationary and mobile-source noise impacts would be incrementally reduced compared to the proposed project, given the overall reduction in development intensity, and impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project. Similarly, operational impacts to on-site sensitive receptors would be reduced since fewer residential and hotel uses would be constructed on-site, and therefore fewer people would be exposed to increased noise levels under this Alternative, though mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts in this regard to less than significant levels. Therefore, overall, operational noise and vibration impacts would be less than under the proposed project.

# j. Population and Housing

Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in direct and indirect increases in population in the City, the Gateway Cities subregion, and the SCAG region. Development of this Alternative would result in a direct population of 798 persons, and an indirect population of 385 persons, for a total of 1,183, compared to the total population of 1,386 under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in fewer population impacts compared to the proposed project and impacts would be less than significant.

Implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative A would also result in additional on-site employment compared to existing conditions. Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in 532 total employment positions compared to 613 under the proposed project. Accounting for the existing estimated employment on-site, this represents an increase in employment positions of 366 under this Alternative and 447 under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a reduced increase in employment positions and associated indirect population growth compared to the proposed project, resulting in reduced impacts in this regard, which would be less than significant. Implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in the development of 275 new residential units, compared to 325 units under the proposed project, which would represent a reduction in indirect population growth. As such, impacts regarding indirect population growth related to housing would less than significant and reduced compared to the proposed project under this Alternative.

## k. Public Services

## (1) Police Protection

Impacts regarding police protection and emergency access would be reduced during construction due to the reduced construction time period under this Alternative, although mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts related to police response times due to temporary lane closures. In addition, as described above, Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in a total population of 1,183 residents compared to 1,386 residents under the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities since it would only result in an increase of approximately 60 crimes per year compared to the 71 under the proposed project. Finally, this Alternative would result in a reduction of

traffic compared to the proposed project, which could impact emergency response times. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities compared to the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.

### (2) Fire Protection

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative A, the demand for fire protection during construction and any impacts to emergency access would be reduced since the construction time period would be shorter compared to the proposed project. In addition, there would be a decrease in demand for fire protection services due to the decrease in the residential, commercial, and hotel uses that would be developed under this Alternative compared to the proposed project. Specifically, with a population increase of 1,183 persons under this Alternative, approximately 146 incidents per year would be expected to occur, compared to 170 incidents under the proposed project. Finally, similar to the proposed project, adequate emergency vehicle access would be ensured through site plan review by the LBFD, and similarly, the buildings would be required to comply with fire flow requirements but would have a reduced impact to water supply or facilities to accommodate the fire flow. Therefore, impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant and reduced compared to the proposed project.

## (3) Schools

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative A, compared to existing conditions, the 275-unit increase in residential units and increase of 366 employment positions would result in a direct and indirect increase in City residents. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in an increase of 108 students to the LBUSD compared to 131 students under the proposed project. Thus, impacts to the LBUSD would be less when compared with the proposed project, and would be less than significant.

### (4) Parks and Recreation

Reduced Intensity Alternative A would include similar recreational amenities to those included in the proposed project, but would not include the theater use. Specifically, this Alternative would include landscaped public open space, private open space, and private recreational areas and balconies. The mix of open space and recreational amenities under this Alternative would be comparable to the proposed project, but private balcony and other private open space areas would be incrementally reduced due to the overall reduction in land use intensity. However, this Alternative, similar to the proposed project, would provide additional park fee funds in compliance with Chapter 18.18, *Park and Recreation Facilities Fee*, of the LBMC. Therefore, this Alternative would result in similar impacts regarding parks and recreation compared to the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.

#### (5) Libraries

As described above, Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in a direct and indirect increase in population of a total of 1,183 persons relative to the proposed project's 1,386 persons. Therefore, this Alternative would require an increase of library items and library square footage to maintain the existing services and facilities per capita. However, since the total population impacting the library services and facilities would be reduced compared to the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to library services and facilities compared to the proposed project.

## I. Traffic and Circulation

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative A, there would be an incremental decrease in the amount of traffic impacting the regional and local roadways relative to the proposed project. Specifically, as shown in Table 15-1 in the project's Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) (Appendix K of this EIR), this Alternative would result in a total of 9,739 weekday and 12,409 weekend average daily vehicle trips, which represents a reduction of 1,551 weekday daily trips, 46 A.M. weekday peak hour trips, 127 P.M. weekday peak hour trips, 1,940 Saturday daily trips, and 173 Saturday midday peak hour trips than the proposed project. Even though this Alternative generates less traffic than the proposed project, a level of service analysis was conducted at the key study intersections to determine this alternative's project impacts and to see if any previously identified intersection impacts will be eliminated with a reduction in trip generation potential. Given that the trip generation for this Alternative is less than that of the proposed project, the level of service analysis focuses to the six (6) key study intersections impacted by the proposed project as identified in Section 8.0 of the TIA (i.e. key study intersections #6, #8, #14, #17, #18, #19). The remaining nineteen (19) key study intersections are not impacted by the proposed project and will not be impacted by this Alternative. The TIA evaluated the relative traffic impacts of Reduced Intensity Alternative A and compared them to impacts of the proposed project, as summarized below.

## **Existing Plus Reduced Intensity Alternative A Traffic Conditions**

Table 15-2 in the project's TIA presents the existing plus project level of service results for Reduced Intensity Alternative A. Review of Column 2 of Table 15-2 indicates that traffic associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative A will significantly impact three key study intersections. The three intersections impacted by Reduced Intensity Alternative A under existing plus project traffic conditions and the time period in which the impact occurs includes:

Key Intersection	Impacted Time Period
14. Bay Shore Avenue at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	P.M. / Saturday
17. PCH at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	A.M. / P.M. / Sat Midday
19. Studebaker Road at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	A.M. / P.M. / Sat Midday

The remaining intersections of PCH/7<sup>th</sup> Street, Studebaker Road/SR-22 WB Ramps and Shopkeeper Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Street are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS with the addition of Reduced Intensity Alternative A project generated traffic to existing traffic. As shown in Columns 3, 4 and 5 of Table 15-2, implementation of the TDM Plan, physical mitigation measures and the project shuttle service reduces the impact of the project at the three impacted key study intersections. The project impact at the intersection of Bay Shore Avenue/2<sup>nd</sup> Street is offset to a level of insignificance. For the remaining two key study intersections of PCH/2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Studebaker Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Street, implementation of improvements reduce the impact of Reduced Intensity Alternative A; however, impacts are still considered significant. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative A's traffic impacts at the intersections of PCH/2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Studebaker Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Street will remain unmitigated as additional capacity-enhancing improvements at these two key study intersections do not appear feasible due to physical and right-of-way restrictions that prohibit any additional widening and/or restriping.

## Year 2015 Plus Reduced Intensity Alternative A Traffic Conditions

Table 15-3 presents the Year 2015 level of service results for Reduced Intensity Alternative A. Review of Column 3 of Table 15-3 indicates that traffic associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative A will significantly impact six key study intersections. The six intersections impacted by Reduced Intensity Alternative A under Year 2015 plus project traffic conditions and the time period in which the impact occurs includes:

Key Intersection	Impacted Time Period
6. PCH at 7 <sup>th</sup> Street	P.M.
8. Studebaker Road at SR-22 Westbound Ramps	P.M.
14. Bay Shore Avenue at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	P.M. / Sat Midday
17. PCH at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	A.M. / P.M. / Sat Midday
18. Shopkeeper Road at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	P.M. / Sat Midday
19. Studebaker Road at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	A.m. / P.M. / Sat Midday

As shown in Columns 4, 5 and 6 of Table 15-3, implementation of the TDM Plan, physical mitigation measures and the project shuttle service reduces the impact of the project at the six impacted key study intersections. The project impacts at the intersections of PCH/7th Street, Studebaker Road/SR-22 WB Ramps, Bay Shore Avenue/2nd Street and Shopkeeper Road/2nd Street are offset to a level of insignificance. For the remaining two key study intersections of PCH/2nd Street and Studebaker Road/2nd Street, implementation of improvements reduce the impact of Reduced Intensity Alternative A; however, impacts are still considered significant. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative A's Year 2015 traffic impacts at the intersections of PCH/2nd Street and Studebaker Road/2nd Street will remain significant as additional capacity-enhancing improvements at these two key study intersections do not appear feasible due to physical and right-of-way restrictions that prohibit any additional widening and/or restriping.

It should be noted that the Reduced Intensity Alternative A existing plus project and Year 2015 recommended improvements at the key impacted intersections are identical to those recommended for the proposed project (refer to Section IV.L., *Traffic and Circulation*, of this EIR).

As shown above, the overall reduction in land use intensity under this Alternative results in a proportionate reduction in impacts to local and regional intersections, though mitigation would still be required at affected locations, and impacts to several intersections would remain significant (e.g., 2nd Street at PCH and 2nd Street and Studebaker Road). As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to study area intersections (including CMP intersections) relative to the proposed project. Further, this Alternative would have less than significant impacts regarding site access given compliance with City site design requirements, and therefore impacts regarding safety hazards and internal circulation would be similar to the proposed project. Similarly, emergency access would be provided per applicable requirements, as is the case with the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant. Reduced Intensity Alternative A would also result in decreased ridership of public transportation and would not require approval of a shared parking plan to ensure parking impacts remain below a level of significance, as a subterranean parking structure would be

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach PCR Services Corporation/SCH No. 2009101014 V-42

constructed with similar parking capacity as under the proposed project. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in fewer impacts to traffic and circulation.

# m. Utilities and Service Systems

## (1) Water Supply

Proposed development under this Alternative would result in the development of 275 residential units, 187,053 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, and 100 hotel rooms. As such, the projected water demand associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative A would be 125,564 gpd or 140.65 AFY, compared to 130,340 gpd or 146.0 AFY under the proposed project. Redevelopment of the project site under this Alternative would require new connections and improvements to water distribution infrastructure similar to the proposed project despite the incremental reduction in development intensity. Construction-related impacts would be temporary and would be less than those associated with the proposed project, given the shorter duration of construction activities. Therefore, since Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in less water demand and similar distribution infrastructure improvements, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

#### (2) Wastewater

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative A, construction activities would occur on-site similar to under the proposed project, though the duration of construction activities would be incrementally shorter given the lower overall development intensity. As such, construction-related wastewater impacts would be similar to the proposed project, as wastewater generation during construction is anticipated to be negligible relative to project operations, and impacts would be less than significant. Operation of this Alternative would result in an average of 55,724 gpd (0.087 cfs) of wastewater generation, compared to a total of 111,448 gpd (0.173 cfs) under the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would result in less demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment, and therefore impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project.

#### (3) Solid Waste

Reduced Intensity Alternative A would require the demolition of the existing hotel buildings and construction of new structures resulting in a total of 331,755 tons of solid waste, slightly less than the proposed project, which would impact the County's unclassified landfills. However, it should be noted that impacts to the County's unclassified landfills would be less than significant with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. In addition, this Alternative would generate approximately 2,235 pounds of solid waste per day during project operation, as opposed to 2,944 pounds of solid waste per day under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts relative to the proposed project as it would result in a net decrease in solid waste going to the County's Class III landfills, and impacts would be less than significant, though mitigation would still be provided to reduce impacts to the maximum extent possible. Additionally, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would comply with all applicable policies and programs related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less under Reduced Intensity Alternative A compared to the proposed project.

#### 3. **IMPACT SUMMARY**

A comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative A with the environmental impacts anticipated under the proposed project is provided in Table V-1 on pages V-5 through V-10. Reduced Intensity Alternative A would result in less impacts to aesthetics (light and glare), air quality/global climate change (construction and operational emissions, toxic air contaminants, AQMP consistency, and global climate change), geology and soils (seismic groundshaking and liquefaction/ground failure), hydrology and water quality (floodplains, construction groundwater quality, and operational surface and groundwater quality), noise (construction noise and vibration, operational stationary source noise, onsite operational noise, off-site mobile-source noise, though mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts to less than significant), population and housing, police protection, fire protection, schools, libraries, traffic and circulation (intersections, CMP facilities [intersections], and parking capacity), water, wastewater (wastewater treatment capacity), and solid waste (landfill capacity). In addition, this Alternative would reduce the significant air quality impacts during construction and operation, and the significant traffic impacts to intersections, including a CMP intersection; however, construction-related and operational air quality/global climate change impacts, as well as land use and traffic impacts would remain significant under this Alternative. It should also be noted that impacts would be similar to the proposed project regarding aesthetics (scenic vistas/views, aesthetics/visual character, and shade/shadow), biological resources (sensitive species, wildlife movement, and conflicts with plans and policies protecting biological resources), cultural resources (archaeological, paleontological, Native American [including human remains], and historic resources, all of which except historic resources would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), geology and soils (soil erosion/loss of topsoil and landslides, lateral spreading, and collapse, which would still require mitigation), hazards and hazardous materials (which would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), hydrology and water quality (flooding/drainage and construction surface water quality), land use (consistency with plans, policies, and regulations, although this impact would remain significant and unavoidable), noise (operational vibration), traffic and circulation (site circulation, emergency access, and conflicts with policies and programs related to alternative transportation), wastewater (wastewater treatment requirements), and solid waste (conflicts with solid waste regulations). However, this Alternative would not result in greater impacts in regards to any environmental issues.

#### 4. RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative A, the same mix of land uses would be provided as under the proposed project, but at a slightly lower development intensity. As such, this Alternative would create a mixed-use project that includes residential condominiums, a full-service hotel, and a successful retail center on the site, as well as create an aesthetically attractive, high quality design that reflects the property's unique orientation adjacent to an active marina. This Alternative would also provide amenities that encourage and promote public access to the marina, such as the Marine/Science Learning Center and cycling center, but would not include the CSULB Repertory Theater. Additionally, Reduced Intensity Alternative A would provide a high level of accessibility to and through the site to ensure a high-quality pedestrian environment, efficient vehicular access, including bicycle facilities, and access to mass transit, similar to the proposed project, and would potentially provide an economically viable reuse of the project site that facilitates soil/groundwater remedial action plans, while minimizing adverse impacts to surrounding properties. As is the case with the proposed project, this Alternative would design and implement comprehensive site development standards that minimize adverse impacts to the environment, as well as enhance the economic vitality of the City and provide property tax, sales tax, and other revenue opportunities, as well as create a

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach V-44

southeastern gateway to the City that is welcoming, iconic in nature, and visible from a distance. Overall, this Alternative would fully or partially achieve all of the project objectives, but not to the extent that the proposed project would. Refer to Table V-3 on page V-83 for a summary of the extent to which this Alternative does or does not meet each of the project objectives identified for the proposed project.

This page intentionally blank.

City of Long Beach
PCR Services Corporation/SCH No. 2009101014 Second+PCH Development

# **B.4. REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE B**

#### 1. DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE

Reduced Intensity Alternative B would involve the development of a similar mix of land uses on the project site as the proposed project, but reduced in terms of commercial/retail and residential development intensity (35- and 33-percent, respectively), and this Alternative would not include the theater use that is included in the proposed project. Hotel, hotel restaurant, hotel meeting space, and marine science center uses, as well as public open space, would be the same as under the proposed project, though non-hotel restaurant uses would be reduced by approximately five percent. However, under this Alternative, maximum building heights would be reduced by approximately 45 percent (i.e., from 12 to six stories, or from 150 feet to 82 feet). Accordingly, this Alternative would include up to 215 residential units, 125,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses, 100 hotel rooms, 4,368 square feet of hotel restaurant space, 20,000 square feet of restaurant uses, a 4,175-square-foot science center, 3,510 square feet of hotel meeting space, 219,134 square feet of public open space, and building heights would range from three stories to a maximum of six stories (i.e., up to 82 feet). Under this Alternative, project-related open space, landscaping, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be provided to serve the development, as is the case under the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the existing soil and groundwater remediation program associated with the former on-site 76 gas station would continue to be implemented under oversight of the Los Angeles RWQCB.

## 2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

#### a. Aesthetics and Views

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative B, the development footprint, architectural design, and landscaping features of the development would be similar to the proposed project, with reduced intensity and reduced building heights throughout the site (i.e., up to six stories, or a maximum of 82 feet with rooftop features). As such, views across the site from PCH would be provided via the Great Space and Marina View Lane, as is the case with the proposed project, and would be enhanced relative to existing conditions. Similarly, site improvements would be comparable to the proposed project and would greatly improve the visual quality of the site compared to existing conditions. The lower intensity of development would result in reduced light generation and less potential for glare effects, and the substantially lower overall building heights would result in reduced shading effects as the proposed project, and these impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts related to aesthetics, scenic vistas/views, light and glare, and shade and shadow would be less than significant and reduced relative to the proposed project.

# b. Air Quality/Global Climate Change

Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in additional impacts to the existing air quality environment. Construction activities would occur on the site under this Alternative, but would not occur for as long a duration as the proposed project, and would result in emissions associated with construction worker traffic, fugitive dust from demolition and excavation, or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Therefore, there would be potentially significant impacts in regards to local and regional construction emissions and GHG emissions during construction. Despite the shorter duration of construction activities under this Alternative, daily construction-related air pollutant emissions, like the proposed project, would result in

significant unavoidable construction air quality impacts with regard to regional and localized impacts and GHG emissions, even with the implementation of applicable mitigation measures. Therefore, although Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in significant unavoidable construction impacts, impacts would be less than the proposed project given the shorter duration of construction activities.

With regard to operations, as Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in new development on the site, and associated operational emissions related to the consumption of electricity and natural gas and vehicular traffic. However, like the proposed project, Reduced Intensity Alternative B would implement a number of land use policies that have direct and indirect positive air quality benefits by reducing vehicle trips through increasing the housing supply in close proximity to jobs or locating a hotel near a entertainment, retail, recreational and restaurant uses, though to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Nonetheless, although new emissions would result from this Alternative, impacts would be less than under the proposed project in regards to local and regional air emissions during operations, though impacts would remain significant even with mitigation. This Alternative would result in new TAC impacts, but like the proposed project, impact in this regard would be less than significant. Finally, this Alternative would result in significant GHG impacts even with implementation of applicable mitigation measures, though impacts would be less than the proposed project given the incremental reduction in intensity of uses.

# c. Biological Resources

Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in the redevelopment of the project site with a similar mix of uses as the proposed project, though reduced in terms of residential and commercial/retail intensity and overall building heights. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, given the developed nature of the project site, lack of notable resources on-site, and distance of the site from viable habitat areas, this Alternative would result in less than significant direct and indirect impacts to sensitive wildlife species, riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, and federally protected wetlands. Furthermore, it is anticipated that implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in the removal of many, if not all, of the existing trees on the project site (some of which may be street trees within the public right-ofway), as is the case with the proposed project. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would require mitigation to reduce impacts related to conflicts with plans, policies, and regulations protecting migratory nesting birds in the project area to less than significant levels. However, impacts associated with removal of street trees would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project. Based on a maximum building height of 82 feet under this Alternative, impacts to wildlife movement, including obstructions to bird flight paths, would be reduced relative to the proposed project, and would therefore be less than significant given similar project design features implemented under this Alternative. Overall, impacts to biological resources under this Alternative would be less than the proposed project.

#### d. Cultural Resources

Reduced Intensity Alternative B would involve excavation and grading for a subterranean parking structure, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would have comparable potential impacts related to the discovery of unknown paleontological, archaeological, or Native American resources, and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Accordingly, impacts to archaeological, paleontological, and Native American resources associated with this Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

This Alternative would involve demolition of the existing Seaport Marina Hotel, which is not considered a historical resource, and would not have an adverse effect on any off-site listed historical resources in the project vicinity (e.g., Marine Stadium). Therefore, impacts to historical resources under this Alternative, similar to the proposed project, would be less than significant.

# e. Geology and Soils

Reduced Intensity Alternative B would redevelop the site with new residential, commercial, and hotel uses at a much higher intensity than exists on the site currently, and would also require substantial excavation for a subterranean parking level, as is the case with the proposed project. Given the decrease in development on-site relative to the proposed project, this Alternative would expose fewer people to risks associated with seismic ground shaking. Similarly, given the high liquefaction potential at the project site, this Alternative would expose people to secondary seismic risks due to seismic ground failure, including liquefaction, but to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Mitigation would still be required under this Alternative with regard to foundation design to address ground shaking and associated liquefaction hazards, but impacts in this regard would be less than the proposed project.

Since Reduced Intensity Alternative B would require similar excavation and grading activities to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in comparable impacts regarding soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. However, as is the case with the proposed project, with compliance with applicable water quality regulations, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. As such, given the comparable amount of grading and excavation under this Alternative, impacts in this regard would be similar to the proposed project and less than significant.

Effects related to landslides, lateral spreading, and collapse would be similar to the proposed project, as no impacts would occur. Impacts related to subsidence would be comparable to those under the proposed project, as foundations would also require the use of pile driving, which can cause vibration-related subsidence, and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Overall, the geology and soils impacts of Reduced Intensity Alternative B would be similar to the proposed project.

#### f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This Alternative would require remediation of existing contamination and other RECs prior to redevelopment of the site, similar to the proposed project. Also like the proposed project, ongoing remediation of groundwater beneath the former on-site gasoline station would continue to occur pending closure of the case by the RWQCB. It is anticipated that the mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project would also be required for implementation of this Alternative, and therefore impacts would be less than significant with mitigation and similar to the proposed project. Since contamination associated with sites listed in government database records are the subject of the remedial activities being performed at the site, impacts related to listed hazardous materials sites would also be less than significant, as is the case with the proposed project.

# g. Hydrology and Water Quality

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative B, there would be a comparable change in the amount of impervious surfaces that would incrementally increase the amount of stormwater to the City storm drains serving the However, it should be noted that the existing stormwater facilities are adequate to accommodate development under the proposed project. In addition, this Alternative would also include extensive landscaping throughout the development that would serve to retain a portion of stormwater onsite that would otherwise be conveyed to local storm drains, as would occur under the proposed project. Regardless, Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in similar impacts with regard to hydrology and drainage, since it would not notably change the amount of surface water runoff.

According to the FIRM provided by FEMA, the project site is located within Zone X, an area located outside the 100-year floodplain, or protected by levees from the 100-year flood. As such, given that this Alternative would increase development intensity relative to existing conditions, the risk associated with floodplains in the project area would also be incrementally increased, though not to the extent that it would under the proposed project. As such, impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project given the reduced number of people located on-site under this Alternative that would be subject to potential flooding associated with 100-year storm events.

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative B, there would be potential impacts to water quality or groundwater during construction activities, as is the case with the proposed project. It should be noted, however, that with development of the proposed project, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels given compliance with applicable water quality regulations. Similarly, while compliance with applicable water quality regulations would reduce impacts to water quality and groundwater during operations, there would be fewer impacts under Reduced Intensity Alternative B, since the intensity of development that would generate pollutants would be incrementally reduced compared to the proposed project. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in fewer impacts to surface water quality, groundwater resources, and groundwater quality compared to the proposed project.

#### h. Land Use

Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in a similar mix of land uses as the proposed project, but would be reduced in terms of residential and commercial/retail development intensity and overall building heights. As such, as with the proposed project, impacts related to compatibility of use would be less than significant, but impacts related to intensity and scale would be significant despite the reduction in building heights, since significant traffic and air quality impacts would still occur (though they would be incrementally reduced relative to the proposed project). While reduced in terms of overall intensity, this Alternative would still require amendments to the City's General Plan, SEADIP, and Local Coastal Program relative to uses and intensity of development, including building heights over 35 feet. Reduced Intensity Alternative B would contribute to the identity of the project area, but not to the same extent as the proposed project. For example, while Reduced Intensity Alternative B would include project-related amenities such as the Marine Science Learning Center and cycling center, it would not include the CSULB Repertory Theater. Thus, Reduced Intensity Alternative B would not support the Land Use Element goal regarding art and culture to the same extent as would the project. Similar to the project, Reduced Intensity Alternative B would enhance pedestrian activity in the area and would enhance the connection of the site to the waterfront. With regard to regional plans, this Alternative would not conflict with SCAG plans and policies, or other relevant plans affecting the project site. As such, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in significant

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach V-50

impacts related to consistency with applicable plans, policies, or regulations affecting the project site. Therefore, overall, this Alternative would result in similar impacts with respect to land use and planning relative to the proposed project.

#### i. Noise

Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in construction activities comparable in intensity to the proposed project on a daily basis, but for a shorter duration given the lower overall amount of development. Therefore, noise and vibration impacts from construction activities would be less than significant given the lack of nearby sensitive receptors, and less than the proposed project based on a shorter construction schedule, though mitigation measures would still be necessary to reduce construction noise (pile driving) impacts to less than significant levels. With regard to operational impacts, stationary and mobile-source noise impacts would be incrementally reduced compared to the proposed project, given the overall reduction in development intensity, and impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project. Similarly, operational impacts to on-site sensitive receptors would be reduced since fewer residential and hotel uses would be constructed on-site, and therefore fewer people would be exposed to increased noise levels under this Alternative, though mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts in this regard to less than significant levels. Therefore, overall, operational noise and vibration impacts would be less than under the proposed project.

# j. Population and Housing

Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in direct and indirect increases in population in the City, the Gateway Cities subregion, and the SCAG region. Development of this Alternative would result in a direct population of 624 persons, and an indirect population of 334 persons, for a total of 958, compared to the total population of 1,386 under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in fewer population impacts compared to the proposed project and impacts would be less than significant.

Implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative B would also result in additional on-site employment compared to existing conditions. Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in 461 total employment positions compared to 613 under the proposed project. Accounting for the existing estimated employment on-site, this represents an increase in employment positions of 295 under this Alternative and 447 under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a reduced increase in employment positions and associated indirect population growth compared to the proposed project, resulting in reduced impacts in this regard, which would be less than significant. Implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in the development of 215 new residential units, compared to 325 units under the proposed project, which would represent a reduction in indirect population growth. As such, impacts regarding indirect population growth related to housing would less than significant and reduced compared to the proposed project under this Alternative.

#### k. Public Services

#### (1) Police Protection

Impacts regarding police protection and emergency access would be reduced during construction due to the reduced construction time period under this Alternative, although mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts related to police response times due to temporary lane closures. In addition, as described

above, Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in a total population of 958 residents compared to 1,386 residents under the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities since it would only result in an increase of approximately 49 crimes per year compared to the 71 under the proposed project. Finally, this Alternative would result in a reduction of traffic compared to the proposed project, which could impact emergency response times. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities compared to the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.

## (2) Fire Protection

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative B, the demand for fire protection during construction and any impacts to emergency access would be reduced since the construction time period would be shorter compared to the proposed project. In addition, there would be a decrease in demand for fire protection services due to the decrease in the residential, commercial, and hotel uses that would be developed under this Alternative compared to the proposed project. Specifically, with a population of 958 persons under this Alternative, approximately 118 incidents per year would be expected to occur, compared to 170 incidents under the proposed project. Finally, similar to the proposed project, adequate emergency vehicle access would be ensured through site plan review by the LBFD, and similarly, the buildings would be required to comply with fire flow requirements but would have a reduced impact to water supply or facilities to accommodate the fire flow. Therefore, impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant and reduced compared to the proposed project.

### (3) Schools

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative B, compared to existing conditions, the 215-unit increase in residential units and increase of 295 employment positions would result in a direct and indirect increase in City residents. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in an increase of 108 students to the LBUSD compared to 131 students under the proposed project. Thus, impacts to the LBUSD would be less when compared with the proposed project, and would be less than significant.

#### (4) Parks and Recreation

Reduced Intensity Alternative B would include similar recreational amenities to those included in the proposed project, but would not include the theater use. Specifically, this Alternative would include landscaped public open space, private open space, and private recreational areas and balconies. The mix of open space and recreational amenities under this Alternative would be comparable to the proposed project, but private balcony and other private open space areas would be incrementally reduced due to the overall reduction in land use intensity. However, this Alternative, similar to the proposed project, would provide additional park fee funds in compliance with Chapter 18.18, Park and Recreation Facilities Fee, of the LBMC. Therefore, this Alternative would result in similar impacts regarding parks and recreation compared to the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.

#### (5) Libraries

As described above, Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in direct and indirect population of 958 persons relative to the proposed project's 1,386 persons. Therefore, this Alternative would require an increase of library items and library square footage to maintain the existing services and facilities per capita. However, since the total population impacting the library services and facilities would be reduced compared

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach V-52

to the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to library services and facilities compared to the proposed project.

#### I. Traffic and Circulation

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative B, there would be an incremental decrease in the amount of traffic impacting the regional and local roadways relative to the proposed project. Specifically, as shown in Table 15-1 in the project's TIA (Appendix K of this EIR), this Alternative would result in a total of 8,506 weekday and 10,866 weekend average daily vehicle trips, which represents a reduction of 2,784 weekday daily trips, 94 A.M. weekday peak hour trips, 230 P.M. weekday peak hour trips, 3,483 Saturday daily trips, and 283 Saturday Midday peak hour trips than the proposed project. Even though this Alternative generates less traffic than the proposed project impacts and to see if any previously identified intersection impacts will be eliminated with a reduction in trip generation potential. Given that the trip generation for this Alternative is less than that of the proposed project, the level of service analysis focuses to the six (6) key study intersections impacted by the proposed project as identified in Section 8.0 of the TIA (i.e. key study intersections #6, #8, #14, #17, #18, #19). The remaining nineteen (19) key study intersections are not impacted by the proposed project and will not be impacted by this Alternative. The TIA evaluated the relative traffic impacts of Reduced Intensity Alternative B and compared them to impacts of the proposed project, as summarized below.

## **Existing Plus Reduced Intensity Alternative B Traffic Conditions**

Table 15-4 in the project's TIA (Appendix K of this EIR) presents the existing plus project level of service results for Reduced Intensity Alternative B. Review of Column 2 of Table 15-4 indicates that traffic associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative B will significantly impact three key study intersections. The three intersections impacted by Reduced Intensity Alternative B under existing plus project traffic conditions and the time period in which the impact occurs includes:

Key Intersection	<u>Impacted Time Period</u>
14. Bay Shore Avenue at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	Saturday
17. PCH at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	A.M. / P.M. / Sat Midday
19. Studebaker Road at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	A.M. / P.M. / Sat Midday

The remaining intersections of PCH/7<sup>th</sup> Street, Studebaker Road/SR-22 WB Ramps and Shopkeeper Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Street are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS with the addition of Reduced Intensity Alternative B project generated traffic to existing traffic. As shown in Columns 3, 4 and 5 of *Table 15-4*, implementation of the TDM Plan, physical mitigation measures and the project shuttle service reduces the impact of the project at the three impacted key study intersections. The project impact at the intersection of Bay Shore Avenue/2<sup>nd</sup> Street is offset to a level of insignificance. For the remaining two key study intersections of PCH/2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Studebaker Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Street, implementation of improvements would reduce the impact of the Reduced Intensity Alternative B project; however, the impacts are still considered significant. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative B project's traffic impacts at the intersections of PCH/2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Studebaker Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Street will remain unmitigated as additional

capacity-enhancing improvements at these two key study intersections do not appear feasible due to physical and right-of-way restrictions that prohibit any additional widening and/or restriping.

### Year 2015 Plus Reduced Intensity Alternative B Traffic Conditions

Table 15-5 in the project's TIA presents the Year 2015 level of service results for Reduced Intensity Alternative B. Review of Column 3 of *Table 15-5* indicates that traffic associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative B will significantly impact six key study intersections. The six intersections impacted by Reduced Intensity Alternative B under Year 2015 plus project traffic conditions and the time period in which the impact occurs includes:

Key Intersection	Impacted Time Period
6. PCH at 7 <sup>th</sup> Street	P.M.
8. Studebaker Road at SR-22 Westbound Ramps	P.M.
14. Bay Shore Avenue at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	Sat Midday
17. PCH at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	A.M. / P.M. / Sat Midday
18. Shopkeeper Road at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	P.M. / Sat Midday
19. Studebaker Road at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	A.M. / P.M. / Sat Midday

As shown in Columns 4, 5 and 6 of Table 15-5, implementation of the TDM Plan, physical mitigation measures and the project shuttle service reduces the impact of the project at the six impacted key study intersections. The project impacts at the intersections of PCH/7<sup>th</sup> Street, Studebaker Road/SR-22 WB Ramps, Bay Shore Avenue/2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Shopkeeper Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Street are offset to a level of insignificance. For the remaining two key study intersections of PCH/2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Studebaker Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Street, implementation of improvements reduce the impact of the Reduced Intensity Alternative B project, however the project impacts are still considered significant. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative B project's Year 2015 traffic impacts at the intersections of PCH/2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Studebaker Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Street will remain unmitigated as additional capacity-enhancing improvements at these two key study intersections do not appear feasible due to physical and right-of-way restrictions that prohibit any additional widening and/or restriping.

It should be noted that the Reduced Intensity Alternative B existing plus project and Year 2015 recommended improvements at the key impacted intersections are identical to those recommended for the proposed project (refer to Section IV.L., *Traffic and Circulation*, of this EIR).

As shown above, the overall reduction in land use intensity under this Alternative results in a proportionate reduction in impacts to local and regional intersections, though mitigation would still be required at affected locations, and impacts to several intersections would remain significant (e.g., 2<sup>nd</sup> Street at PCH). As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to study area intersections (including CMP intersections) relative to the proposed project. Further, this Alternative would have less than significant impacts regarding site access given compliance with City site design requirements, and therefore impacts regarding safety hazards

and internal circulation would be similar to the proposed project. Similarly, emergency access would be provided per applicable requirements, as is the case with the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant. Reduced Intensity Alternative B would also result in decreased ridership of public transportation and would not require approval of a shared parking plan to ensure parking impacts remain below a level of significance, as a subterranean parking structure would be constructed with similar parking capacity as under the proposed project. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in fewer impacts to traffic and circulation.

## m. Utilities and Service Systems

## (1) Water Supply

Proposed development under this Alternative would result in the development of 215 residential units, 157,053 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, and 100 hotel rooms. As such, the projected water demand associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative B would be 106,174 gpd or 118.93 AFY, compared to 130,340 gpd or 146.0 AFY under the proposed project. Redevelopment of the project site under this Alternative would require new connections and improvements to water distribution infrastructure similar to the proposed project despite the incremental reduction in development intensity. Construction-related impacts would be temporary and would be less than those associated with the proposed project, given the shorter duration of construction activities. Therefore, since Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in less water demand and similar distribution infrastructure improvements, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

## (2) Wastewater

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative B, construction activities would occur on-site similar to under the proposed project, though the duration of construction activities would be incrementally shorter given the lower overall development intensity. As such, construction-related wastewater impacts would be similar to the proposed project, as wastewater generation during construction is anticipated to be negligible relative to project operations, and impacts would be less than significant. Operation of this Alternative would result in an average of 40,764 gpd (0.063 cfs) of wastewater generation, compared to a total of 111,448 gpd (0.173 cfs) under the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would result in less demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment, and therefore impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project.

#### (3) Solid Waste

Reduced Intensity Alternative B would require the demolition of the existing hotel buildings and construction of new structures resulting in a total of 331,755 tons of solid waste, slightly less than the proposed project, which would impact the County's unclassified landfills. However, it should be noted that impacts to the County's unclassified landfills would be less than significant with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. In addition, this Alternative would generate approximately 1,845 pounds of solid waste per day during project operation, as opposed to 2,944 pounds of solid waste per day under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts relative to the proposed project as it would result in a net decrease in solid waste going to the County's Class III landfills, and impacts would be less than significant, though mitigation would still be provided to reduce impacts to the maximum extent possible. Additionally, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would comply

with all applicable policies and programs related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less under Reduced Intensity Alternative B compared to the proposed project.

#### 3. IMPACT SUMMARY

A comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative B with the environmental impacts anticipated under the proposed project is provided in Table V-2 on pages V-7 through V-13. Reduced Intensity Alternative B would result in less impacts to aesthetics (light and glare), air quality/global climate change (construction and operational emissions, toxic air contaminants, AQMP consistency, and global climate change), biological resources (wildlife movement), geology and soils (seismic groundshaking and liquefaction/ground failure), hydrology and water quality (floodplains, construction groundwater quality, and operational surface and groundwater quality), noise (construction noise and vibration, operational stationary source noise, on-site operational noise, off-site mobile-source noise, though mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts to less than significant), population and housing, police protection, fire protection, schools, libraries, traffic and circulation (intersections, CMP facilities [intersections], and parking capacity), water, wastewater (wastewater treatment capacity), and solid waste (landfill capacity). In addition, this Alternative would reduce the significant air quality impacts during construction and operation, and the significant traffic impacts to intersections, including a CMP intersection; however, construction-related and operational air quality/global climate change impacts, as well as land use and traffic impacts would remain significant under this Alternative. It should also be noted that impacts would be similar to the proposed project regarding aesthetics (scenic vistas/views, aesthetics/visual character, and shade/shadow), biological resources (sensitive species and conflicts with plans and policies protecting biological resources), cultural resources (archaeological, paleontological, Native American [including human remains], and historic resources, all of which except historic resources would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), geology and soils (soil erosion/loss of topsoil and landslides, lateral spreading, and collapse, which would still require mitigation), hazards and hazardous materials (which would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), hydrology and water quality (flooding/drainage and construction surface water quality), land use (consistency with plans, policies, and regulations, although this impact would remain significant and unavoidable), noise (operational vibration), traffic and circulation (site circulation, emergency access, and conflicts with policies and programs related to alternative transportation), wastewater (wastewater treatment requirements), and solid waste (conflicts with solid waste regulations). However, this Alternative would not result in greater impacts in regards to any environmental issues.

## 4. RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative B, the same mix of land uses would be provided as under the proposed project, but at an incrementally lower development intensity. As such, this Alternative would create a mixed-use project that includes residential condominiums, a full-service hotel, and a successful retail center on the site, as well as create an aesthetically attractive, high quality design that reflects the property's unique orientation adjacent to an active marina. This Alternative would also provide amenities that encourage and promote public access to the marina, such as the Marine/Science Learning Center and cycling center, but would not include the CSULB Repertory Theater. Additionally, Reduced Intensity Alternative B would provide a high level of accessibility to and through the site to ensure a high-quality pedestrian environment, efficient vehicular access, including bicycle facilities, and access to mass transit, similar to the proposed project, and would potentially provide an economically viable reuse of the project site that facilitates

soil/groundwater remedial action plans, while minimizing adverse impacts to surrounding properties. As is the case with the proposed project, this Alternative would design and implement comprehensive site development standards that minimize adverse impacts to the environment, as well as enhance the economic vitality of the City and provide property tax, sales tax, and other revenue opportunities, as well as create a southeastern gateway to the City that is welcoming, iconic in nature, and visible from a distance (though building heights would be roughly half of that of the proposed project). Overall, this Alternative would fully or partially achieve all of the project objectives, but not to the extent that the proposed project would. Refer to Table V-3 on page V-83 for a summary of the extent to which this Alternative does or does not meet each of the project objectives identified for the proposed project.

This page intentionally blank.

City of Long Beach
PCR Services Corporation/SCH No. 2009101014 Second+PCH Development

# **B.5. REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE C**

#### 1. **DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE**

Reduced Intensity Alternative C would involve the development of a similar mix of land uses on the project site as the proposed project, but reduced in terms of commercial/retail and residential development intensity (40- and 70-percent, respectively), and this Alternative would not include the theater use that is included in the proposed project. Hotel, hotel restaurant, hotel meeting space, non-hotel restaurant, and marine science center uses, as well as public open space, would all be the same as under the proposed project. However, under this Alternative, maximum building heights would be reduced by a minimum of 45 percent (i.e., from 12 stories to fewer than six stories, or from 150 feet to less than 82 feet). Accordingly, this Alternative would include up to 100 residential units, 115,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses, 100 hotel rooms, 4,368 square feet of hotel restaurant space, 21,092 square feet of restaurant uses, a 4,175square-foot science center, 3,510 square feet of hotel meeting space, 219,134 square feet of public open space, and building heights would range from three stories to less than six stories (i.e., less than 82 feet). Under this Alternative, project-related open space, landscaping, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be provided to serve the development, as is the case under the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the existing soil and groundwater remediation program associated with the former on-site 76 gas station would continue to be implemented under oversight of the Los Angeles RWQCB.

#### 2. **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CATEGORIES**

#### a. Aesthetics and Views

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative C, the development footprint, architectural design, and landscaping features of the development would be similar to the proposed project, with reduced intensity and reduced building heights throughout the site (i.e., less than six stories or 82 feet including rooftop features). As such, views across the site from PCH would be provided via the Great Space and Marina View Lane, as is the case with the proposed project, and would be enhanced relative to existing conditions. improvements would be comparable to the proposed project and would greatly improve the visual quality of the site compared to existing conditions. The lower intensity of development would result in reduced light generation and less potential for glare effects, and the substantially lower overall building heights would result in reduced shading effects as the proposed project, and these impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts related to aesthetics, scenic vistas/views, light and glare, and shade and shadow would be less than significant and reduced relative to the proposed project.

# b. Air Quality/Global Climate Change

Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in additional impacts to the existing air quality environment. Construction activities would occur on the site under this Alternative, but would not occur for as long a duration as the proposed project, and would result in emissions associated with construction worker traffic, fugitive dust from demolition and excavation, or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Therefore, there would be potentially significant impacts in regards to local and regional construction emissions and GHG emissions during construction. Despite the shorter duration of construction activities under this Alternative, daily construction-related air pollutant emissions, like the proposed project, would result in significant unavoidable construction air quality impacts with regard to regional and localized impacts and

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach V-59

GHG emissions, even with the implementation of applicable mitigation measures. Therefore, although Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in significant unavoidable construction impacts, impacts would be less than the proposed project given the shorter duration of construction activities.

With regard to operations, as Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in new development on the site, and associated operational emissions related to the consumption of electricity and natural gas and vehicular traffic. However, like the proposed project, Reduced Intensity Alternative C would implement a number of land use policies that have direct and indirect positive air quality benefits by reducing vehicle trips through increasing the housing supply in close proximity to jobs or locating a hotel near a entertainment, retail, recreational and restaurant uses, though to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Nonetheless, although new emissions would result from this Alternative, impacts would be less than under the proposed project in regards to local and regional air emissions during operations, though impacts would remain significant even with mitigation. This Alternative would result in new TAC impacts, but like the proposed project, impact in this regard would be less than significant. Finally, this Alternative would result in significant GHG impacts even with implementation of applicable mitigation measures, though impacts would be less than the proposed project given the incremental reduction in intensity of uses.

# c. Biological Resources

Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in the redevelopment of the project site with a similar mix of uses as the proposed project, though reduced in terms of residential and commercial/retail intensity and overall building heights. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, given the developed nature of the project site, lack of notable resources on-site, and distance of the site from viable habitat areas, this Alternative would result in less than significant direct and indirect impacts to sensitive wildlife species, riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, and federally protected wetlands. Furthermore, it is anticipated that implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in the removal of many, if not all, of the existing trees on the project site (some of which may be street trees within the public right-ofway), as is the case with the proposed project. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would require mitigation to reduce impacts related to conflicts with plans, policies, and regulations protecting migratory nesting birds in the project area to less than significant levels. However, impacts associated with removal of street trees would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project. Based on a maximum building height of under 82 feet under this Alternative, impacts to wildlife movement, including obstructions to bird flight paths, would be reduced relative to the proposed project, and would be less than significant given similar project design features implemented under this Alternative. Overall, impacts to biological resources under this Alternative would be less than the proposed project.

## d. Cultural Resources

Reduced Intensity Alternative C would involve excavation and grading for a subterranean parking structure, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would have comparable potential impacts related to the discovery of unknown paleontological, archaeological, or Native American resources, and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Accordingly, impacts to archaeological, paleontological, and Native American resources associated with this Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

This Alternative would involve demolition of the existing Seaport Marina Hotel, which is not considered a historical resource, and would not have an adverse effect on any off-site listed historical resources in the project vicinity (e.g., Marine Stadium). Therefore, impacts to historical resources under this Alternative, similar to the proposed project, would be less than significant.

# e. Geology and Soils

Reduced Intensity Alternative C would redevelop the site with new residential, commercial, and hotel uses at a much higher intensity than exists on the site currently, and would also require substantial excavation for a subterranean parking level, as is the case with the proposed project. Given the decrease in development on-site relative to the proposed project, this Alternative would expose fewer people to risks associated with seismic ground shaking. Similarly, given the high liquefaction potential at the project site, this Alternative would expose people to secondary seismic risks due to seismic ground failure, including liquefaction, but to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Mitigation would still be required under this Alternative with regard to foundation design to address ground shaking and associated liquefaction hazards, but impacts in this regard would be less than the proposed project.

Since Reduced Intensity Alternative C would require similar excavation and grading activities to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in comparable impacts regarding soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. However, as is the case with the proposed project, with compliance with applicable water quality regulations, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. As such, given the comparable amount of grading and excavation under this Alternative, impacts in this regard would be similar to the proposed project and less than significant.

Effects related to landslides, lateral spreading, and collapse would be similar to the proposed project, as no impacts would occur. Impacts related to subsidence would be comparable to those under the proposed project, as foundations would also require the use of pile driving, which can cause vibration-related subsidence, and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Overall, the geology and soils impacts of Reduced Intensity Alternative C would be similar to the proposed project.

#### f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This Alternative would require remediation of existing contamination and other RECs prior to redevelopment of the site, similar to the proposed project. Also like the proposed project, ongoing remediation of groundwater beneath the former on-site gasoline station would continue to occur pending closure of the case by the RWQCB. It is anticipated that the mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project would also be required for implementation of this Alternative, and therefore impacts would be less than significant with mitigation and similar to the proposed project. Since contamination associated with sites listed in government database records are the subject of the remedial activities being performed at the site, impacts related to listed hazardous materials sites would also be less than significant, as is the case with the proposed project.

# g. Hydrology and Water Quality

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative C, there would be a comparable change in the amount of impervious surfaces that would incrementally increase the amount of stormwater to the City storm drains serving the project site. However, it should be noted that the existing stormwater facilities are adequate to accommodate development under the proposed project. In addition, this Alternative would also include extensive landscaping throughout the development that would serve to retain a portion of stormwater onsite that would otherwise be conveyed to local storm drains, as would occur under the proposed project. Regardless, Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in similar impacts with regard to hydrology and drainage, since it would not notably change the amount of surface water runoff.

According to the FIRM provided by FEMA, the project site is located within Zone X, an area located outside the 100-year floodplain, or protected by levees from the 100-year flood. As such, given that this Alternative would increase development intensity relative to existing conditions, the risk associated with floodplains in the project area would also be incrementally increased, though not to the extent that it would under the proposed project. As such, impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project given the reduced number of people located on-site under this Alternative that would be subject to potential flooding associated with 100-year storm events.

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative C, there would be potential impacts to water quality or groundwater during construction activities, as is the case with the proposed project. It should be noted, however, that with development of the proposed project, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels given compliance with applicable water quality regulations. Similarly, while compliance with applicable water quality regulations would reduce impacts to water quality and groundwater during operations, there would be fewer impacts under Reduced Intensity Alternative C, since the intensity of development that would generate pollutants would be incrementally reduced compared to the proposed project. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in fewer impacts to surface water quality, groundwater resources, and groundwater quality compared to the proposed project.

#### h. Land Use

Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in a similar mix of land uses as the proposed project, but would be reduced in terms of residential and commercial/retail development intensity and overall building heights. As such, as with the proposed project, impacts related to compatibility of use would be less than significant, but impacts related to intensity and scale would be significant despite the reduction in building heights, since significant traffic and air quality impacts would still occur (though they would be incrementally reduced relative to the proposed project). While reduced in terms of overall intensity, this Alternative would still require amendments to the City's General Plan, SEADIP, and Local Coastal Program relative to uses and intensity of development, including building heights over 35 feet. Reduced Intensity Alternative C would contribute to the identity of the project area, but not to the same extent as the proposed project. For example, while Reduced Intensity Alternative C would include project-related amenities such as the Marine Science Learning Center and cycling center, it would not include the CSULB Repertory Theater. Thus, Reduced Intensity Alternative C would not support the Land Use Element goal regarding art and culture to the same extent as would the project. Similar to the project, Reduced Intensity Alternative C would enhance pedestrian activity in the area and would enhance the connection of the site to the waterfront. With regard to regional plans, this Alternative would not conflict with SCAG plans and policies, or other relevant plans affecting the project site. As such, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in significant

impacts related to consistency with applicable plans, policies, or regulations affecting the project site. Therefore, overall, this Alternative would result in similar impacts with respect to land use and planning relative to the proposed project.

#### i. Noise

Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in construction activities comparable in intensity to the proposed project on a daily basis, but for a shorter duration given the lower overall amount of development. Therefore, noise and vibration impacts from construction activities would be less than significant given the lack of nearby sensitive receptors, and less than the proposed project based on a shorter construction schedule, though mitigation measures would still be necessary to reduce construction noise (pile driving) impacts to less than significant levels. With regard to operational impacts, stationary and mobile-source noise impacts would be incrementally reduced compared to the proposed project, given the overall reduction in development intensity, and impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project. Similarly, operational impacts to on-site sensitive receptors would be reduced since fewer residential and hotel uses would be constructed on-site, and therefore fewer people would be exposed to increased noise levels under this Alternative, though mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts in this regard to less than significant levels. Therefore, overall, operational noise and vibration impacts would be less than under the proposed project.

# j. Population and Housing

Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in direct and indirect increases in population in the City, the Gateway Cities subregion, and the SCAG region. Development of this Alternative would result in a direct population increase of 290 persons, and an indirect population increase of 319 persons, for a total increase of 609, compared to the total population of 1,386 under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in fewer population impacts compared to the proposed project and impacts would be less than significant.

Implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative C would also result in additional on-site employment compared to existing conditions. Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in 440 total employment positions compared to 613 under the proposed project. Accounting for the existing estimated employment on-site, this represents an increase in employment positions of 274 under this Alternative and 447 under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a reduced increase in employment positions and associated indirect population growth compared to the proposed project, resulting in reduced impacts in this regard, which would be less than significant. Implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in the development of 100 new residential units, compared to 325 units under the proposed project, which would represent a reduction in indirect population growth. As such, impacts regarding indirect population growth related to housing would less than significant and reduced compared to the proposed project under this Alternative.

### k. Public Services

## (1) Police Protection

Impacts regarding police protection and emergency access would be reduced during construction due to the reduced construction time period under this Alternative, although mitigation would still be required to

reduce impacts related to police response times due to temporary lane closures. In addition, as described above, Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in a total population of 609 residents compared to 1,386 residents under the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities since it would only result in an increase of approximately 31 crimes per year compared to the 71 under the proposed project. Finally, this Alternative would result in a reduction of traffic compared to the proposed project, which could impact emergency response times. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities compared to the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.

### (2) Fire Protection

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative C, the demand for fire protection during construction and any impacts to emergency access would be reduced since the construction time period would be shorter compared to the proposed project. In addition, there would be a decrease in demand for fire protection services due to the decrease in the residential, commercial, and hotel uses that would be developed under this Alternative compared to the proposed project. Specifically, with a population of 609 persons under this Alternative, approximately 75 incidents per year would be expected to occur, compared to 170 incidents under the proposed project. Finally, similar to the proposed project, adequate emergency vehicle access would be ensured through site plan review by the LBFD, and similarly, the buildings would be required to comply with fire flow requirements but would have a reduced impact to water supply or facilities to accommodate the fire flow. Therefore, impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant and reduced compared to the proposed project.

## (3) Schools

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative C, compared to existing conditions, the 100-unit increase in residential units and increase of 274 employment positions would result in a direct and indirect increase in City residents. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in an increase of 42 students to the LBUSD compared to 131 students under the proposed project. Thus, impacts to the LBUSD would be less when compared with the proposed project, and would be less than significant.

### (4) Parks and Recreation

Reduced Intensity Alternative C would include similar recreational amenities to those included in the proposed project, but would not include the theater use. Specifically, this Alternative would include landscaped public open space, private open space, and private recreational areas and balconies. The mix of open space and recreational amenities under this Alternative would be comparable to the proposed project, but private balcony and other private open space areas would be incrementally reduced due to the overall reduction in land use intensity. However, this Alternative, similar to the proposed project, would provide additional park fee funds in compliance with Chapter 18.18, Park and Recreation Facilities Fee, of the LBMC. Therefore, this Alternative would result in similar impacts regarding parks and recreation compared to the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.

### (5) Libraries

As described above, Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in a direct and indirect increase in population of a total of 609 persons relative to the proposed project's 1,386 persons. Therefore, this Alternative would require an increase of library items and library square footage to maintain the existing

services and facilities per capita. However, since the total population impacting the library services and facilities would be reduced compared to the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to library services and facilities compared to the proposed project.

## I. Traffic and Circulation

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative C, there would be an incremental decrease in the amount of traffic impacting the regional and local roadways relative to the proposed project. Specifically, as shown in Table 15-1 in the project's TIA (Appendix K of this EIR), this Alternative would result in a total of 9,739 weekday and 12,409 weekend average daily vehicle trips, which represents a reduction of 3,440 weekday daily trips, 145 A.M. weekday peak hour trips, 286 P.M. weekday peak hour trips, 4,229 Saturday daily trips, and 354 Saturday Midday peak hour trips than the proposed project. Even though this Alternative generates less traffic than the proposed project, a level of service analysis was conducted at the key study intersections to determine this alternative's project impacts and to see if any previously identified intersection impacts will be eliminated with a reduction in trip generation potential. Given that the trip generation for this Alternative is less than that of the proposed project, the level of service analysis focuses to the six (6) key study intersections impacted by the proposed project as identified in Section 8.0 of the TIA (i.e. key study intersections #6, #8, #14, #17, #18, #19). The remaining nineteen (19) key study intersections are not impacted by the proposed project and will not be impacted by this Alternative. The TIA evaluated the relative traffic impacts of Reduced Intensity Alternative C and compared them to impacts of the proposed project, as summarized below.

# **Existing Plus Reduced Intensity Alternative C Traffic Conditions**

Table 15-6 in the project's TIA presents the existing plus project level of service results for Reduced Intensity Alternative C. Review of Column 2 of Table 15-6 indicates that traffic associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative C will significantly impact three key study intersections. The three intersections impacted by Reduced Intensity Alternative C under existing plus project traffic conditions and the time period in which the impact occurs includes:

Key Intersection	<u>Impacted Time Period</u>
14. Bay Shore Avenue at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	Saturday
17. PCH at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	A.M. / P.M. / Sat Midday
19. Studebaker Road at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	A.M. / P.M. / Sat Midday

The remaining intersections of PCH/ $7^{th}$  Street, Studebaker Road/SR-22 WB Ramps and Shopkeeper Road/ $2^{nd}$  Street are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS with the addition of Reduced Intensity Alternative C project generated traffic to existing traffic. As shown in Columns 3, 4 and 5 of Table 15-6, implementation of the TDM Plan, physical mitigation measures and the project shuttle service reduces the impact of the project at the three impacted key study intersections. The project impact at the intersection of Bay Shore Avenue/ $2^{nd}$  Street is offset to a level of insignificance. For the remaining two key study intersections of PCH/ $2^{nd}$  Street and Studebaker Road/ $2^{nd}$  Street, implementation of improvements

would reduce the impact of Reduced Intensity Alternative C; however, impacts are still considered significant. Therefore, this Alternative's traffic impacts at the intersections of PCH/2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Studebaker Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Street will remain unmitigated as additional capacity-enhancing improvements at these two key study intersections do not appear feasible due to physical and right-of-way restrictions that prohibit any additional widening and/or restriping.

#### Year 2015 Plus Reduced Intensity Alternative C Traffic Conditions

Table 15-7 in the project's TIA presents the year 2015 level of service results for Reduced Intensity Alternative C. Review of Column 3 of Table 15-7 indicates that traffic associated with this Alternative will significantly impact five key study intersections. The intersection of PCH/7th Street is not impacted by this Alternative. The five intersections impacted by Reduced Intensity Alternative C under Year 2015 plus project traffic conditions and the time period in which the impact occurs includes:

Key Intersection	Impacted Time Period
8. Studebaker Road at SR-22 Westbound Ramps	P.M.
14. Bay Shore Avenue at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	Sat Midday
17. PCH at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	A.M. / P.M. / Sat Midday
18. Shopkeeper Road at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	P.M. / Sat Midday
19. Studebaker Road at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	A.M. / P.M. / Sat Midday

As shown in Columns 4, 5 and 6 of Table 15-7, implementation of the TDM Plan, physical mitigation measures and the project shuttle service reduces the impact of the project at the five impacted key study intersections. The project impacts at the intersections of Studebaker Road/SR-22 WB Ramps, Bay Shore Avenue/2nd Street and Shopkeeper Road/2nd Street are offset to a level of insignificance. For the remaining two key study intersections of PCH/2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Studebaker Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Street, implementation of improvements would reduce the impact of this Alternative; however, impacts are still considered significant. Therefore, this Alternative's Year 2015 traffic impacts at the intersections of PCH/2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Studebaker Road/2nd Street will remain unmitigated as additional capacity-enhancing improvements at these two key study intersections do not appear feasible due to physical and right-of-way restrictions that prohibit any additional widening and/or restriping.

It should be noted that the Reduced Intensity Alternative C existing plus project and Year 2015 recommended improvements at the key impacted intersections are identical to those recommended for the proposed project (refer to Section IV.L., *Traffic and Circulation*, of this EIR).

As shown above, the overall reduction in land use intensity under this Alternative results in a proportionate reduction in impacts to local and regional intersections, though mitigation would still be required at affected locations, and impacts to several intersections would remain significant (e.g., 2<sup>nd</sup> Street at PCH and Studebaker Road/2nd Street). As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to study area intersections (including CMP intersections) relative to the proposed project. Further, this Alternative would have less than significant impacts regarding site access given compliance with City site design requirements,

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach PCR Services Corporation/SCH No. 2009101014 V-66

and therefore impacts regarding safety hazards and internal circulation would be similar to the proposed project. Similarly, emergency access would be provided per applicable requirements, as is the case with the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant. Reduced Intensity Alternative C would also result in decreased ridership of public transportation and would not require approval of a shared parking plan to ensure parking impacts remain below a level of significance, as a subterranean parking structure would be constructed with similar parking capacity as under the proposed project. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in fewer impacts to traffic and circulation.

## m. Utilities and Service Systems

## (1) Water Supply

Proposed development under this Alternative would result in the development of 215 residential units, 148,145 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, and 100 hotel rooms. As such, the projected water demand associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative C would be 78,508 gpd or 87.94 AFY, compared to 130,340 gpd or 146.0 AFY under the proposed project. Redevelopment of the project site under this Alternative would require new connections and improvements to water distribution infrastructure similar to the proposed project despite the incremental reduction in development intensity. Construction-related impacts would be temporary and would be less than those associated with the proposed project, given the shorter duration of construction activities. Therefore, since Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in less water demand and similar distribution infrastructure improvements, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

## (2) Wastewater

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative C, construction activities would occur on-site similar to under the proposed project, though the duration of construction activities would be incrementally shorter given the lower overall development intensity. As such, construction-related wastewater impacts would be similar to the proposed project, as wastewater generation during construction is anticipated to be negligible relative to project operations, and impacts would be less than significant. Operation of this Alternative would result in an average of 40,764 gpd (0.063 cfs) of wastewater generation, compared to a total of 111,448 gpd (0.173 cfs) under the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would result in less demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment, and therefore impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project.

### (3) Solid Waste

Reduced Intensity Alternative C would require the demolition of the existing hotel buildings and construction of new structures resulting in a total of 331,755 tons of solid waste, slightly less than the proposed project, which would impact the County's unclassified landfills. However, it should be noted that impacts to the County's unclassified landfills would be less than significant with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. In addition, this Alternative would generate approximately 1,335 pounds of solid waste per day during project operation, as opposed to 2,944 pounds of solid waste per day under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts relative to the proposed project as it would result in a net decrease in solid waste going to the County's Class III landfills, and impacts would be less than significant, though mitigation would still be provided to reduce impacts to the maximum extent possible. Additionally, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would comply

with all applicable policies and programs related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less under Reduced Intensity Alternative C compared to the proposed project.

#### 3. **IMPACT SUMMARY**

A comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative C with the environmental impacts anticipated under the proposed project is provided in Table V-2 on pages V-7 through V-13. Reduced Intensity Alternative C would result in less impacts to aesthetics (light and glare), air quality/global climate change (construction and operational emissions, toxic air contaminants, AQMP consistency, and global climate change), biological resources (wildlife movement), geology and soils (seismic groundshaking and liquefaction/ground failure), hydrology and water quality (floodplains, construction groundwater quality, and operational surface and groundwater quality), noise (construction noise and vibration, operational stationary source noise, on-site operational noise, off-site mobile-source noise, though mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts to less than significant), population and housing, police protection, fire protection, schools, libraries, traffic and circulation (intersections, CMP facilities [intersections], and parking capacity), water, wastewater (wastewater treatment capacity), and solid waste (landfill capacity). In addition, this Alternative would reduce the significant air quality impacts during construction and operation, and the significant traffic impacts to intersections, including a CMP intersection; however, construction-related and operational air quality/global climate change impacts, as well as land use and traffic impacts would remain significant under this Alternative. It should also be noted that impacts would be similar to the proposed project regarding aesthetics (scenic vistas/views, aesthetics/visual character, and shade/shadow), biological resources (sensitive species and conflicts with plans and policies protecting biological resources), cultural resources (archaeological, paleontological, Native American [including human remains], and historic resources, all of which except historic resources would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), geology and soils (soil erosion/loss of topsoil and landslides, lateral spreading, and collapse, which would still require mitigation), hazards and hazardous materials (which would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), hydrology and water quality (flooding/drainage and construction surface water quality), land use (consistency with plans, policies, and regulations, although this impact would remain significant and unavoidable), noise (operational vibration), traffic and circulation (site circulation, emergency access, and conflicts with policies and programs related to alternative transportation), wastewater (wastewater treatment requirements), and solid waste (conflicts with solid waste regulations). However, this Alternative would not result in greater impacts in regards to any environmental issues.

#### 4. RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative C, the same mix of land uses would be provided as under the proposed project, but at substantially lower development intensity. As such, this Alternative would create a mixed-use project that includes residential condominiums, a full-service hotel, and a successful retail center on the site, as well as create an aesthetically attractive, high quality design that reflects the property's unique orientation adjacent to an active marina. This Alternative would also provide amenities that encourage and promote public access to the marina, such as the Marine/Science Learning Center and cycling center, but would not include the CSULB Repertory Theater. Additionally, Reduced Intensity Alternative C would provide a high level of accessibility to and through the site to ensure a high-quality pedestrian environment, efficient vehicular access, including bicycle facilities, and access to mass transit, similar to the proposed project, and would potentially provide an economically viable reuse of the project site that facilitates

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach PCR Services Corporation/SCH No. 2009101014 V-68

soil/groundwater remedial action plans, while minimizing adverse impacts to surrounding properties. As is the case with the proposed project, this Alternative would design and implement comprehensive site development standards that minimize adverse impacts to the environment, as well as enhance the economic vitality of the City and provide property tax, sales tax, and other revenue opportunities, as well as create a southeastern gateway to the City that is welcoming, iconic in nature, and visible from a distance (though building heights would be less than half of those of the proposed project). Overall, this Alternative would fully or partially achieve all of the project objectives, but not to the extent that the proposed project would. Refer to Table V-3 on page V-83 for a summary of the extent to which this Alternative does or does not meet each of the project objectives identified for the proposed project.

This page intentionally blank.

City of Long Beach
PCR Services Corporation/SCH No. 2009101014 Second+PCH Development

## **B.6. REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE D**

### 1. DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE

Reduced Intensity Alternative D would involve the development of a comparable mix of land uses on the project site as the proposed project, but would be reduced in terms of commercial/retail intensity (40-percent), would not include residential development, and would not include the theater use that is included in the proposed project. Hotel, hotel restaurant, hotel meeting space, non-hotel restaurant, and marine science center uses, as well as public open space, would all be the same as under the proposed project. However, under this Alternative, maximum building heights would be reduced by a minimum of 45 percent (i.e., from 12 stories to fewer than six stories, or from 150 feet to less than 82 feet). Accordingly, this Alternative would include no residential units, 115,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses, 100 hotel rooms, 4,368 square feet of hotel restaurant space, 21,092 square feet of restaurant uses, a 4,175-square-foot science center, 3,510 square feet of hotel meeting space, 219,134 square feet of public open space, and building heights would range from three stories to less than six stories (i.e., less than 82 feet). Under this Alternative, project-related open space, landscaping, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be provided to serve the development, as is the case under the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the existing soil and groundwater remediation program associated with the former on-site 76 gas station would continue to be implemented under oversight of the Los Angeles RWQCB.

### 2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

#### a. Aesthetics and Views

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative D, the development footprint, architectural design, and landscaping features of the development would be similar to the proposed project, with reduced intensity and reduced building heights throughout the site (i.e., less than six stories or 82 feet including rooftop features). As such, views across the site from PCH would be provided via the Great Space and Marina View Lane, as is the case with the proposed project, and would be enhanced relative to existing conditions. Similarly, site improvements would be comparable to the proposed project and would greatly improve the visual quality of the site compared to existing conditions. The lower intensity of development would result in reduced light generation and less potential for glare effects, and the substantially lower overall building heights would result in reduced shading effects as the proposed project, and these impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts related to aesthetics, scenic vistas/views, light and glare, and shade and shadow would be less than significant and reduced relative to the proposed project.

# b. Air Quality/Global Climate Change

Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in additional impacts to the existing air quality environment. Construction activities would occur on the site under this Alternative, but would not occur for as long a duration as the proposed project, and would result in emissions associated with construction worker traffic, fugitive dust from demolition and excavation, or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Therefore, there would be potentially significant impacts in regards to local and regional construction emissions and GHG emissions during construction. Despite the shorter duration of construction activities under this Alternative, daily construction-related air pollutant emissions, like the proposed project, would result in significant unavoidable construction air quality impacts with regard to regional and localized impacts and

GHG emissions, even with the implementation of applicable mitigation measures. Therefore, although Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in significant unavoidable construction impacts, impacts would be less than the proposed project given the shorter duration of construction activities.

With regard to operations, as Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in new development on the site, and associated operational emissions related to the consumption of electricity and natural gas and vehicular traffic. However, unlike the proposed project, Reduced Intensity Alternative D would not implement a number of land use policies that have direct and indirect positive air quality benefits by reducing vehicle trips through increasing the housing supply in close proximity to jobs or locating a hotel near a entertainment, retail, recreational and restaurant uses, given the lack of residential uses under this Alternative. Nonetheless, although new emissions would result from this Alternative, impacts would be less than under the proposed project in regards to local and regional air emissions during operations, though impacts would remain significant even with mitigation. This Alternative would result in new TAC impacts, but like the proposed project, impact in this regard would be less than significant. Finally, this Alternative would result in significant GHG impacts even with implementation of applicable mitigation measures, though impacts would be less than the proposed project given the incremental reduction in intensity of uses.

## c. Biological Resources

Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in the redevelopment of the project site with a similar mix of uses as the proposed project, though without any residential uses and reduced in terms of commercial/retail intensity. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, given the developed nature of the project site, lack of notable resources on-site, and distance of the site from viable habitat areas, this Alternative would result in less than significant direct and indirect impacts to sensitive wildlife species, riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, and federally protected wetlands. Furthermore, it is anticipated that implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in the removal of many, if not all, of the existing trees on the project site (some of which may be street trees within the public right-of-way), as is the case with the proposed project. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would require mitigation to reduce impacts related to conflicts with plans, policies, and regulations protecting migratory nesting birds in the project area to less than significant levels. However, impacts associated with removal of street trees would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project. Based on a maximum building height of less than 82 feet under this Alternative, impacts to wildlife movement, including obstructions to bird flight paths, would be reduced relative to the proposed project, and would be less than significant given similar project design features implemented under this Alternative. Overall, impacts to biological resources under this Alternative would be less than the proposed project.

## d. Cultural Resources

Reduced Intensity Alternative D would involve excavation and grading for a subterranean parking structure, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would have comparable potential impacts related to the discovery of unknown paleontological, archaeological, or Native American resources, and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Accordingly, impacts to archaeological, paleontological, and Native American resources associated with this Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

Second+PCH Development **City of Long Beach** V-72

This Alternative would involve demolition of the existing Seaport Marina Hotel, which is not considered a historical resource, and would not have an adverse effect on any off-site listed historical resources in the project vicinity (e.g., Marine Stadium). Therefore, impacts to historical resources under this Alternative, similar to the proposed project, would be less than significant.

## e. Geology and Soils

Reduced Intensity Alternative D would redevelop the site with new residential, commercial, and hotel uses at a much higher intensity than exists on the site currently, and would also require substantial excavation for a subterranean parking level, as is the case with the proposed project. Given the decrease in development on-site relative to the proposed project, this Alternative would expose fewer people to risks associated with seismic ground shaking. Similarly, given the high liquefaction potential at the project site, this Alternative would expose people to secondary seismic risks due to seismic ground failure, including liquefaction, but to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Mitigation would still be required under this Alternative with regard to foundation design to address ground shaking and associated liquefaction hazards, but impacts in this regard would be less than the proposed project.

Since Reduced Intensity Alternative D would require similar excavation and grading activities to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in comparable impacts regarding soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. However, as is the case with the proposed project, with compliance with applicable water quality regulations, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. As such, given the comparable amount of grading and excavation under this Alternative, impacts in this regard would be similar to the proposed project and less than significant.

Effects related to landslides, lateral spreading, and collapse would be similar to the proposed project, as no impacts would occur. Impacts related to subsidence would be comparable to those under the proposed project, as foundations would also require the use of pile driving, which can cause vibration-related subsidence, and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Overall, the geology and soils impacts of Reduced Intensity Alternative D would be similar to the proposed project.

#### f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This Alternative would require remediation of existing contamination and other RECs prior to redevelopment of the site, though perhaps to a lesser extent than the proposed project given the lack of residential uses, at the discretion of affected regulatory agencies. In any case, ongoing remediation of groundwater beneath the former on-site gasoline station would continue to occur pending closure of the case by the RWQCB. It is anticipated that the mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project would also be required for implementation of this Alternative, and therefore impacts would be similar to the proposed project and less than significant with mitigation. Impacts related to listed hazardous materials sites pertain to the former on-site gas station and off-site Mobil station, which have resulted in the aforementioned soil and groundwater contamination at the project site. Given that the remediation process is ongoing for these sites, impacts would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

## g. Hydrology and Water Quality

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative D, there would be a comparable change in the amount of impervious surfaces that would incrementally increase the amount of stormwater to the City storm drains serving the However, it should be noted that the existing stormwater facilities are adequate to accommodate development under the proposed project. In addition, this Alternative would also include extensive landscaping throughout the development that would serve to retain a portion of stormwater onsite that would otherwise be conveyed to local storm drains, as would occur under the proposed project. Regardless, Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in similar impacts with regard to hydrology and drainage, since it would not notably change the amount of surface water runoff.

According to the FIRM provided by FEMA, the project site is located within Zone X, an area located outside the 100-year floodplain, or protected by levees from the 100-year flood. As such, given that this Alternative would increase development intensity relative to existing conditions, the risk associated with floodplains in the project area would also be incrementally increased, though not to the extent that it would under the proposed project. As such, impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project given the reduced number of people located on-site under this Alternative that would be subject to potential flooding associated with 100-year storm events.

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative D, there would be potential impacts to water quality or groundwater during construction activities, as is the case with the proposed project. It should be noted, however, that with development of the proposed project, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels given compliance with applicable water quality regulations. Similarly, while compliance with applicable water quality regulations would reduce impacts to water quality and groundwater during operations, there would be fewer impacts under Reduced Intensity Alternative D, since the intensity of development that would generate pollutants would be incrementally reduced compared to the proposed project. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in fewer impacts to surface water quality, groundwater resources, and groundwater quality compared to the proposed project.

### h. Land Use

Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in a similar mix of land uses as the proposed project, though without any residential uses and reduced in terms of commercial/retail intensity and overall building heights. Given the lower scale and intensity of development under this Alternative, impacts related to compatibility of use would be less than significant, as under the proposed project. However, impacts related to intensity and scale would be significant despite the reduction in building heights, since significant traffic and air quality impacts would still occur (though they would be incrementally reduced relative to the proposed project). While reduced in terms of overall intensity, this Alternative would still require amendments to the City's General Plan, SEADIP, and Local Coastal Program relative to uses and intensity of development, including building heights over 35 feet. Reduced Intensity Alternative D would contribute to the identity of the project area, but not to the same extent as the proposed project. For example, while Reduced Intensity Alternative D would include project-related amenities such as the Marine Science Learning Center and cycling center, it would not include the CSULB Repertory Theater. Thus, Reduced Intensity Alternative D would not support the Land Use Element goal regarding art and culture to the same extent as would the project, and would also fail to meet relevant goals and policies related to mobility and the provision of housing to the extent the proposed project would, including the following: maintain or improve the current ability to move people and goods to and from activity centers while reinforcing the

quality of life in the neighborhoods; permit sufficient employment and residential densities along transit routes to encourage transit ridership; increase the amount and quality of moderate and higher density housing along selected corridors; and reinforce local mobility goals by reducing peak-hour traffic congestion. Similar to the project, Reduced Intensity Alternative D would enhance pedestrian activity in the area and would enhance the connection of the site to the waterfront. With regard to regional plans, this Alternative would not conflict with SCAG plans and policies, or other relevant plans affecting the project site. As such, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in significant impacts related to consistency with applicable plans, policies, or regulations affecting the project site. Therefore, overall, this Alternative would result in similar impacts with respect to land use and planning relative to the proposed project.

### i. Noise

Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in construction activities comparable in intensity to the proposed project on a daily basis, but for a shorter duration given the lower overall amount of development. Therefore, noise and vibration impacts from construction activities would be less than significant given the lack of nearby sensitive receptors, and less than the proposed project based on a shorter construction schedule, though mitigation measures would still be necessary to reduce construction noise (pile driving) impacts to less than significant levels. With regard to operational impacts, stationary and mobile-source noise impacts would be incrementally reduced compared to the proposed project, given the overall reduction in development intensity, and impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project. Similarly, operational impacts to on-site sensitive receptors would be reduced since no residential uses would be constructed on-site, and therefore fewer people would be exposed to increased noise levels under this Alternative, though mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts in this regard to less than significant levels. Therefore, overall, operational noise and vibration impacts would be less than under the proposed project.

## j. Population and Housing

Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in direct and indirect increases in population in the City, the Gateway Cities subregion, and the SCAG region. Development of this Alternative would result in no direct population growth, and an indirect population of 319 persons, compared to the total population of 1,386 under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in fewer population impacts compared to the proposed project and impacts would be less than significant.

Implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative D would also result in additional on-site employment compared to existing conditions. Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in 440 total employment positions compared to 613 under the proposed project. Accounting for the existing estimated employment on-site, this represents an increase in employment positions of 274 under this Alternative and 447 under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a reduced increase in employment positions and associated indirect population growth compared to the proposed project, resulting in reduced impacts in this regard, which would be less than significant. Implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in the development no new residential units, compared to 325 units under the proposed project, which would represent a reduction in indirect population growth. As such, impacts regarding indirect population growth related to housing would less than significant and reduced compared to the proposed project under this Alternative.

### k. Public Services

## (1) Police Protection

Impacts regarding police protection and emergency access would be reduced during construction due to the reduced construction time period under this Alternative, although mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts related to police response times due to temporary lane closures. In addition, as described above, Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in a total population of 319 residents compared to 1,386 residents under the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities since it would only result in an increase of approximately 16 crimes per year compared to the 71 under the proposed project. Finally, this Alternative would result in a reduction of traffic compared to the proposed project, which could impact emergency response times. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities compared to the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.

## (2) Fire Protection

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative D, the demand for fire protection during construction and any impacts to emergency access would be reduced since the construction time period would be shorter compared to the proposed project. In addition, there would be a decrease in demand for fire protection services due to the decrease in the residential, commercial, and hotel uses that would be developed under this Alternative compared to the proposed project. Specifically, with a population of 319 persons under this Alternative, approximately 39 incidents per year would be expected to occur, compared to 170 incidents under the proposed project. Finally, similar to the proposed project, adequate emergency vehicle access would be ensured through site plan review by the LBFD, and similarly, the buildings would be required to comply with fire flow requirements but would have a reduced impact to water supply or facilities to accommodate the fire flow. Therefore, impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant and reduced compared to the proposed project.

### (3) Schools

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative D, compared to existing conditions, increase of 274 employment positions would result in an indirect increase in City residents. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in an increase of four (4) students to the LBUSD compared to 131 students under the proposed project. Thus, impacts to the LBUSD would be less when compared with the proposed project, and would be less than significant.

#### (4) Parks and Recreation

Reduced Intensity Alternative D would include similar recreational amenities to those included in the proposed project, but would not include the theater use. Specifically, this Alternative would include landscaped public open space, private open space, and private recreational areas and hotel balconies. The mix of open space and recreational amenities under this Alternative would be comparable to the proposed project, but private balcony and other private hotel-related open space areas would be incrementally reduced due to the overall reduction in land use intensity and lack of residential uses. Furthermore, this Alternative, unlike the proposed project, would not be required to provide additional park fee funds as no residential uses would be constructed therefore it would not be subject to Chapter 18.18, *Park and* 

City of Long Beach

Second+PCH Development

Second+PCH Development

*Recreation Facilities Fee*, of the LBMC. Therefore, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts regarding parks and recreation compared to the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.

## (5) Libraries

As described above, Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in an indirect increase in population of a total of 319 persons relative to the proposed project's 1,386 persons. Therefore, this Alternative would require an increase of library items and library square footage to maintain the existing services and facilities per capita. However, since the total population impacting the library services and facilities would be reduced compared to the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to library services and facilities compared to the proposed project.

## I. Traffic and Circulation

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative D, there would be an incremental decrease in the amount of traffic impacting the regional and local roadways relative to the proposed project. Specifically, as shown in Table 15-1 in the project's TIA (Appendix K of this EIR), this Alternative would result in a total of 9,739 weekday and 12,409 weekend average daily vehicle trips, which represents a reduction of 3,770 weekday daily trips, 185 A.M. weekday peak hour trips, 321 P.M. weekday peak hour trips, 4,542 Saturday daily trips, and 385 Saturday Midday peak hour trips than the proposed project. Given that Reduced Intensity Alternative D has a similar trip generation potential (although slightly less) to that of Reduced Intensity Alternative C, it can be qualitatively concluded that the traffic impacts associated with this Alternative would be the same or less than those identified above for Reduced Intensity Alternative C. Therefore, the overall reduction in land use intensity under this Alternative results in a proportionate reduction in impacts to local and regional intersections, though mitigation would still be required at affected locations, and impacts to several intersections would remain significant (e.g., 2nd Street at PCH). As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to study area intersections (including CMP intersections) relative to the proposed project. Further, this Alternative would have less than significant impacts regarding site access given compliance with City site design requirements, and therefore impacts regarding safety hazards and internal circulation would be similar to the proposed project. Similarly, emergency access would be provided per applicable requirements, as is the case with the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant. Reduced Intensity Alternative D would also result in decreased ridership of public transportation and would not require approval of a shared parking plan to ensure parking impacts remain below a level of significance, as a subterranean parking structure would be constructed with similar parking capacity as under the proposed project. Therefore, Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in fewer impacts to traffic and circulation.

## m. Utilities and Service Systems

## (1) Water Supply

Proposed development under this Alternative would result in the development of 275 residential units, 187,053 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, and 100 hotel rooms. As such, the projected water demand associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative D would be 56,189 gpd or 62.94 AFY, compared to 130,340 gpd or 146.0 AFY under the proposed project. Redevelopment of the project site under this Alternative would require new connections and improvements to water distribution infrastructure similar to the proposed project despite the incremental reduction in development intensity. Construction-related impacts would be temporary and would be less than those associated with the proposed project, given the shorter

duration of construction activities. Therefore, since Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in less water demand and similar distribution infrastructure improvements, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

## (2) Wastewater

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative D, construction activities would occur on-site similar to under the proposed project, though the duration of construction activities would be incrementally shorter given the lower overall development intensity. As such, construction-related wastewater impacts would be similar to the proposed project, as wastewater generation during construction is anticipated to be negligible relative to project operations, and impacts would be less than significant. Operation of this Alternative would result in an average of 24,764 gpd (0.038 cfs) of wastewater generation, compared to a total of 111,448 gpd (0.173 cfs) under the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would result in less demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment, and therefore impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project.

## (3) Solid Waste

Reduced Intensity Alternative D would require the demolition of the existing hotel buildings and construction of new structures resulting in a total of 331,755 tons of solid waste, slightly less than the proposed project, which would impact the County's unclassified landfills. However, it should be noted that impacts to the County's unclassified landfills would be less than significant with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. In addition, this Alternative would generate approximately 935 pounds of solid waste per day during project operation, as opposed to 2,944 pounds of solid waste per day under the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts relative to the proposed project as it would result in a net decrease in solid waste going to the County's Class III landfills, and impacts would be less than significant, though mitigation would still be provided to reduce impacts to the maximum extent possible. Additionally, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would comply with all applicable policies and programs related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less under Reduced Intensity Alternative D compared to the proposed project.

#### 3. **IMPACT SUMMARY**

A comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with Reduced Intensity Alternative D with the environmental impacts anticipated under the proposed project is provided in Table V-2 on pages V-7 through V-13. Reduced Intensity Alternative D would result in less impacts to aesthetics (light and glare), air quality/global climate change (construction and operational emissions, toxic air contaminants, AQMP consistency, and global climate change), biological resources (wildlife movement), geology and soils (seismic groundshaking and liquefaction/ground failure), hydrology and water quality (floodplains, construction groundwater quality, and operational surface and groundwater quality), noise (construction noise and vibration, operational stationary source noise, on-site operational noise, off-site mobile-source noise, though mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts to less than significant), population and housing, police protection, fire protection, schools, libraries, traffic and circulation (intersections, CMP facilities [intersections], and parking capacity), water, wastewater (wastewater treatment capacity), and solid waste (landfill capacity). In addition, this Alternative would reduce the significant air quality impacts during construction and operation, and the significant traffic impacts to intersections, including a CMP intersection; however, construction-related and operational air quality/global climate change impacts, as well as land use

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach PCR Services Corporation/SCH No. 2009101014 V-78

and traffic impacts would remain significant under this Alternative. It should also be noted that impacts would be similar to the proposed project regarding aesthetics (scenic vistas/views, aesthetics/visual character, and shade/shadow), biological resources (sensitive species and conflicts with plans and policies protecting biological resources), cultural resources (archaeological, paleontological, Native American [including human remains], and historic resources, all of which except historic resources would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), geology and soils (soil erosion/loss of topsoil and landslides, lateral spreading, and collapse, which would still require mitigation), hazards and hazardous materials (which would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), hydrology and water quality (flooding/drainage and construction surface water quality), land use (consistency with plans, policies, and regulations, although this impact would remain significant and unavoidable), noise (operational vibration), traffic and circulation (site circulation, emergency access, and conflicts with policies and programs related to alternative transportation), wastewater (wastewater treatment requirements), and solid waste (conflicts with solid waste regulations). However, this Alternative would not result in greater impacts in regards to any environmental issues.

### 4. RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Under Reduced Intensity Alternative D, a similar mix of land uses would be provided as under the proposed project, but at substantially lower development intensity that does not include any residential units. As such, this Alternative would fail to meet a basic project objective of providing residential condominiums on the project site. Nonetheless, this Alternative would create a non-residential mixed-use project that includes a full-service hotel and a successful retail center on the site, as well as create an aesthetically attractive, high quality design that reflects the property's unique orientation adjacent to an active marina. This Alternative would also provide amenities that encourage and promote public access to the marina, such as the Marine/Science Learning Center and cycling center, but would not include the CSULB Repertory Theater. Additionally, Reduced Intensity Alternative D would provide a high level of accessibility to and through the site to ensure a high-quality pedestrian environment, efficient vehicular access, including bicycle facilities, and access to mass transit, similar to the proposed project, and would potentially provide an economically viable reuse of the project site that facilitates soil/groundwater remedial action plans, while minimizing adverse impacts to surrounding properties. As is the case with the proposed project, this Alternative would design and implement comprehensive site development standards that minimize adverse impacts to the environment, as well as enhance the economic vitality of the City and provide property tax, sales tax, and other revenue opportunities, as well as create a southeastern gateway to the City that is welcoming, iconic in nature, and visible from a distance (though building heights would be less than half of those of the proposed project). Overall, this Alternative would fully or partially achieve all of the project objectives, but not to the extent that the proposed project would. Refer to Table V-3 on page V-83 for a summary of the extent to which this Alternative does or does not meet each of the project objectives identified for the proposed project.

This page intentionally blank.

City of Long Beach
PCR Services Corporation/SCH No. 2009101014 Second+PCH Development

## C. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a proposed project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. The CEQA Guidelines also state that should it be determined that the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall identify another environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives. With respect to identifying an environmentally superior alternative among those analyzed in this EIR, the range of feasible alternatives to be considered includes Alternative 1, the No Project/No Development Alternative; Alternative 2, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative; Alternative 3, Reduced Intensity Alternative A; Alternative 4, Reduced Intensity Alternative B; Alternative 5, Reduced Intensity Alternative C; and Alternative 6, Reduced Intensity Alternative D.

A comparative summary of the environmental impacts anticipated under each alternative with the environmental impacts associated with the proposed project is provided in Table V-2 on pages V-7 through V-13. A more detailed description of the potential impacts associated with each alternative is provided above. Pursuant to Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, the analysis below addresses the ability of the alternatives to "avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects" of the project. Additionally, **Table V-3**, Summary of Alternatives vs. Project Objectives, below, summarizes the extent to which each Alternative meets or does not meet each of the project objectives identified for the proposed project.

Of the Alternatives analyzed in the EIR, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered the overall environmentally superior alternative as it would reduce all of the significant or potentially significant impacts occurring under the Second+PCH project, including impacts related to air quality/global climate change (local and regional construction air emissions, AQMP consistency, regional operational air emissions, global climate change), biological resources (conflicts with plans, policies, and regulations protecting biological resources), cultural resources (archeological, paleontological, and Native American [including human remains] resources), geology and soils (liquefaction and vibration-related subsidence), hazards and hazardous materials, land use plan consistency, construction and operational noise, police protection, and traffic impacts to surrounding local and CMP intersections to levels that are less than significant. However, as indicated above, this Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives established for the proposed project.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines' requirement to identify an environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative, a comparative evaluation of the remaining alternatives indicates that Reduced Intensity Alternative D would be environmentally superior. Relative to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in less impacts to aesthetics (light and glare), air quality/global climate change (construction and operational emissions, toxic air contaminants, AQMP consistency, and global climate change), biological resources (wildlife movement), geology and soils (seismic groundshaking and liquefaction/ground failure), hydrology and water quality (floodplains, construction groundwater quality, and operational surface and groundwater quality), , noise (construction noise and vibration, operational stationary source noise, on-site operational noise, off-site mobile-source noise, though mitigation would still be required to reduce impacts to less than significant), population and housing, police protection, fire protection, schools, libraries, traffic and circulation (intersections, CMP facilities [intersections], and parking capacity), water, wastewater (wastewater treatment capacity), and solid waste (landfill capacity). In

Second+PCH Development City of Long Beach V-81

Table V-3
Summary of Alternatives vs. Project Objectives

Project Objective	Ability of Alternative to Meet Project Objective					
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5	Alternative 6
Create a mixed-use project that includes residential condominiums, a full-service hotel, and a successful retail center on the site.	Does Not Meet Objective	Does Not Meet Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Partially Meets Objective
Create an aesthetically attractive, high quality design that reflects the property's unique orientation adjacent to an active marina.	Does Not Meet Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective
Provide amenities that encourage and promote public access to the marina.	Does Not Meet Objective	Does Not Meet Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective
Provide a high level of accessibility to and through the site to ensure a high-quality pedestrian environment, efficient vehicular access, including bicycle facilities, and access to mass transit.	Does Not Meet Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective
Provide an economically viable reuse of the project site that facilitates soil/groundwater remedial action plans, while minimizing adverse impacts to surrounding properties.	Does Not Meet Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective
Design and implement comprehensive site development standards that minimize adverse impacts to the environment.	Does Not Meet Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective
Enhance the economic vitality of the City and provide property tax, sales tax, and other revenue opportunities.	Does Not Meet Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Partially Meets Objective
Create a southeastern gateway to the City that is welcoming, iconic in nature, and visible from a distance.	Does Not Meet Objective	Does Not Meet Objective	Fully Meets Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Partially Meets Objective

Source: PCR Services Corporation, 2011

addition, this Alternative would reduce the significant air quality impacts during construction and operation, and the significant traffic impacts to intersections, including a CMP intersection; however, constructionrelated and operational air quality/global climate change impacts, as well as land use and traffic impacts would remain significant under this Alternative. It should also be noted that impacts would be similar to the proposed project regarding aesthetics (scenic vistas/views, aesthetics/visual character, and shade/shadow), biological resources (sensitive species and conflicts with plans and policies protecting biological resources), cultural resources (archaeological, paleontological, Native American [including human remains], and historic resources, all of which except historic resources would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), geology and soils (soil erosion/loss of topsoil and landslides, lateral spreading, and collapse, which would still require mitigation), hazards and hazardous materials (which would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), hydrology and water quality (flooding/drainage and construction surface water quality), land use (consistency with plans, policies, and regulations, although this impact would remain significant and unavoidable), noise (operational vibration), traffic and circulation (site circulation, emergency access, and conflicts with policies and programs related to alternative transportation), wastewater (wastewater treatment requirements), and solid waste (conflicts with solid waste regulations). However, this Alternative would not result in greater impacts in regards to any environmental issues. In addition, this Alternative would fully or partially achieve all of the project objectives, but not to the extent that the proposed project would. This is due to the fact that while this Alternative would provide for redevelopment of the project site with retail, restaurant, and hotel uses oriented toward the adjacent marina, with project architectural and landscaping features that would create an attractive development with access to various forms of transportation, and would also provide public amenities such as the Marine Science Learning Center and Coastal Cycling Center, this Alternative would not provide residential uses on-site and would not include the CSULB Repertory Theater. As such, this Alternative fails to meet a basic project objective, which is to provide residential uses on-site as part of the mixed-use project. Additionally, it is possible that this Alternative, while mixed-use in nature, would not provide an adequate amount of development to be economically viable, such that it would not meet the objective of creating a successful mixed-use project, and likewise would not contribute as much revenue to the City as the proposed project once developed. Furthermore, while this Alternative would define to some degree a southeastern gateway to the City, with building heights under six stories (or less than 82 feet), this Alternative would not meet the project objective of a welcoming, iconic and visible development to the same extent as the proposed project (which has building heights up to 150 feet).