

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 Purpose and Scope

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) include a discussion of reasonable project alternatives that would “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). This chapter identifies potential alternatives to the Proposed Project and evaluates them, as required by CEQA.

Key provisions of the CEQA Guidelines on alternatives (Section 15126.6[a] through [f]) are summarized below to explain the foundation and legal requirements for the alternatives analysis in the EIR.

- “The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly” (15126.6[b]).
- “The specific alternative of ‘no project’ shall also be evaluated along with its impact” (15126.6[e][1]).
- “The no project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published, and at the time the environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would reasonably be 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. If the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘no project’ alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives” (15126.6[e][2]).
- “The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a ‘rule of reason’ that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project” (15126.6[f]).
- “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 (or the site is already owned by the proponent)” (15126.6[f][1]).

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

- “For alternative locations, “only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR” (15126.6[f][2][A]).
- “An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative” (15126.6[f][3]).

For each development alternative, this analysis:

- Describes the alternative,
- Analyzes the impact of the alternative as compared to the proposed project,
- Identifies the impacts of the project that would be avoided or lessened by the alternative,
- Assesses whether the alternative would meet most of the basic project objectives, and
- Evaluates the comparative merits of the alternative and the project.

Per the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), additional significant effects of the alternatives are discussed in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.

7.1.2 Guiding Principles

The following five guiding principles accompany the vision to guide future development and improvements that would occur within the Project Site and support citywide efforts to increase non-motorized transportation, promote healthy living options, and work toward a more sustainable future. These guiding principles will aid decision makers in their review of the project and associated environmental impacts:

- **Enhanced Mobility and Complete Streets.** Long Beach Boulevard must evolve to prioritize and enhance the walkability of the corridor, improve mobility options for bicycles and transit riders, and preserve functionality of the corridor as a thoroughfare for automobiles. The addition of trees, landscape, furnishings, and bike lanes; improved pedestrian crossings; and small changes in travel lanes will enhance the public realm experience for all users.
- **Safety and Wellness.** The physical environment plays a critical role in our community’s overall health. Providing active and passive park spaces for urban neighborhoods along Long Beach Boulevard is critical to improve health and wellness. A well-designed street creates a safer and more appealing setting for families, bicyclists, and others along the corridor. Additionally, the Plan proposes physical and programmatic connections between health-related institutions, park areas, and the public right-of-way.
- **A Sustainable Future.** The City of Long Beach supports a sustainable future for its residents, its businesses, and the environment. The Midtown area should improve and develop in a sustainable manner by decreasing the reliance on automobiles, reducing the urban heat-island effect, and promoting a balance of jobs and housing.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

- **Supporting Urban Amenities.** The supporting amenities serving Midtown must be improved to stimulate reinvestment and attract new development. Midtown must be an enjoyable place to live and do business. Improvements and new development will seek out urban amenities such as attractive rights-of-way, safe and efficient bikeway and pedestrian facilities, parks and parklets, and landscaping enhancements.
- **Working with and for the Community.** The ideas and plans presented in this specific plan were generated by close coordination with the existing resident, business, property owner, and development communities. Working with and for the community does not stop after the adoption of the plan. This plan places special emphasis on coordinating public and private improvements and programming with Long Beach Memorial and other medical facilities in Midtown.

7.2 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The following significant and unavoidable impacts are identified in Chapter 5, *Environmental Analysis*, of this Draft EIR:

Air Quality

- **Impact 5.2-1:** The Proposed Project would generate short-term emissions that exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's regional construction significance thresholds and would significantly contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3 would reduce criteria air pollutants generated from project-related construction activities. However, buildout of the Proposed Project would occur over a period of approximately 18 years or longer. Construction time frames and equipment for individual site-specific projects are not available at this time. There is a potential for multiple developments to be constructed at any one time, resulting in significant construction-related emissions. Therefore, despite adherence to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3, Impact 5.2-1 would remain **significant and unavoidable**.
- **Impact 5.2-2:** The Proposed Project would generate long-term emissions that exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's regional operational significance thresholds and would significantly contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin. Incorporation of Mitigation Measures AQ-4 through AQ-6 would reduce operation-related criteria air pollutants generated from stationary and mobile sources. Mitigation Measures AQ-5 and AQ-6 would encourage and accommodate use of alternative-fueled vehicles and nonmotorized transportation. However, despite adherence to Mitigation Measures AQ-4 through AQ-6, Impact 5.2-2 would remain **significant and unavoidable** due to the magnitude of land use development associated with the Proposed Project.
- **Impact 5.2-3:** Construction activities related to the buildout of the Proposed Project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3 applied for Impact 5.2-1 would reduce the project's regional construction emissions and therefore also reduce the project's localized construction-related criteria air

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

pollutant emissions to the extent feasible. However, because existing sensitive receptors may be close to project-related construction activities, construction emissions generated by individual development projects have the potential to exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's localized significance thresholds. Therefore, Impact 5.2-3 would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

- **Impact 5.2-6:** The Proposed Project is a regionally significant project that would contribute to an increase in frequency or severity of air quality violations in the South Coast Air Basin and would conflict with the assumptions of the applicable Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Mitigation measures applied for Impact 5.2-1 and Impact 5.2-2 would reduce the Proposed Project's regional construction-related and operational phase criteria air pollutant emissions to the extent feasible. However, given the potential increase in growth and associated increase in criteria air pollutant emissions, the Proposed Project would continue to be potentially inconsistent with the assumptions in the AQMP. Therefore, Impact 5.2-6 would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- **Impact 5.5-1:** Buildout of the Proposed Project would result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions compared to existing conditions and would not meet the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Year 2035 Target efficiency metric of 2.4 metric tons of CO₂e per year per service population or the long-term GHG reduction goal under Executive Order S-3-05. Mitigation Measures AQ-4 through AQ-6 would encourage and accommodate use of alternative-fueled vehicles and nonmotorized transportation and ensure that GHG emissions from the buildout of the Proposed Project would be minimized. However, additional statewide measures would be necessary to reduce GHG emissions under the Proposed Project to meet the long-term GHG reduction goals under Executive Order S-3-05, which identified a goal to reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, and Executive Order B-30-15, which identified a goal to reduce GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The new Executive Order B-30-15 requires the California Air Resources Board to prepare another update to the Scoping Plan to address the 2030 target for the state. At this time, there is no plan past 2020 that achieves the long-term GHG reduction goal established under Executive Order S-3-05 or the new Executive Order B-30-15. As identified by the California Council on Science and Technology, the state cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advancements in technology. Since no additional statewide measures are currently available, Impact 5.5-1 would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

Noise

- **Impact 5.9-1:** Noise from construction activities associated with future development projects that would be accommodated by the Proposed Project could result in substantial impacts to sensitive receptors. Mitigation Measures N-1 and N-2 would reduce potential noise impacts during construction to the extent feasible. However, due to the potential for proximity of construction activities to sensitive uses and potential longevity of construction activities, Impact 5.9-1 (construction noise) would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED DURING THE SCOPING/PROJECT PLANNING PROCESS

The following is a discussion of the land use alternatives considered during the scoping and planning process and the reasons why they were not selected for detailed analysis in this Draft EIR (EIR).

7.3.1 Alternative Development Areas

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project. The key question and first step in the analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR (Guidelines Sec. 15126[5][B][1]). In general, any development of the size and type proposed by the project would have substantially the same impacts on air quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. Without a site specific analysis, impacts on aesthetics, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, and hydrology and water quality cannot be evaluated. These impacts were found to be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, another location would not avoid or substantially lessen the effects of the Proposed Project.

The purpose of the Proposed Project is to create a transit corridor plan which would enhance an underutilized area and expand development opportunities that response to transit investments. The Project Site is served by a number of transit opportunities, including the Metro light-rail and Long Beach Transit (LBT) bus routes. The Metro Blue Line runs directly through the Project Site along Long Beach Boulevard and connects downtown Los Angeles to downtown Long Beach, and LBT provides bus services via Routes 1, 51, and 52 also along Long Beach Boulevard. The transit improvements along this segment of Long Beach Boulevard help create an opportunity for redevelopment of this largely commercial corridor with mixed land uses, which is a unique site within the City of Long Beach.

Further, the proposed buildout of the Proposed Project would allow for up to 3,695 dwelling units, 3,008,611 square feet of commercial/employment uses, 983 hospital beds, and 277 hotel rooms within the Project Site. No other transit corridors within the City would be able to accommodate this proposed growth while achieving the Proposed Project's guiding principles, which are detailed above in Section 7.1.2, *Guiding Principles*. Therefore, no other sites were considered for further alternatives analysis.

7.4 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

Based on the criteria listed above, the following four alternatives have been determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives which have the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but which may avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. These alternatives are analyzed in detail in the following sections.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

- No Project/No Development Alternative
- No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative
- Reduced Intensity/Density Alternative
- Residential Focus Alternative

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative and where the No Project/No Development Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated. Each alternative's environmental impacts are compared to the Proposed Project and determined to be environmentally superior, neutral, or inferior. However, only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are used in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the Proposed Project. Only the impacts involving air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation and traffic were found to be significant and unavoidable, as outlined in Section 7.2, *Significant and Unavoidable Impacts*. Section 7.9, *Environmentally Superior Alternative*, identifies the alternative that was determined to be environmentally superior.

The Proposed Project is analyzed in detail in Chapter 5, *Environmental Analysis*, of this DEIR.

7.4.1 Alternatives Comparison

The following statistical analysis provides a summary of general socioeconomic build-out projections determined by the four land use alternatives, including the Proposed Project. It is important to note that these are not growth projections. That is, they do not anticipate what is likely to occur by a certain time horizon, but rather provide a build-out scenario that would only occur if all the areas of the City were to develop to the probable capacities yielded by the land use alternatives. The following statistics were developed as a tool to understand better the difference between the alternatives analyzed in the DEIR. Table 7-1 identifies City-wide information regarding dwelling unit, population and employment projections, and also provides the jobs to housing ratio for each of the alternatives.

Table 7-1 Build-out Statistical Summary

	Proposed Project	No Project/No Development Alternative	No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative	Reduced Intensity/Density Alternative	Residential Focus Alternative
Dwelling Units	3,695	1,959	5,922	2,795	3,395
Population	10,306	6,133	17,161	7,833	9,486
Commercial/Employment Square Feet	3,008,611	2,639,679	5,045,077	2,358,611	2,214,351
Employment	15,648	12,861	20,471	14,595	14,195
Jobs-to-Housing Ratio	4.23	6.57	3.46	5.22	4.18

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.5 NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative assumes the Proposed Project would not be implemented, which includes adoption of the Midtown Specific Plan. It also assumes that no new development would occur and the Project Site would be considered completely built out. Therefore, all existing land uses would remain with no additional development in the future. Table 7-1, *Build-out Statistical Summary*, compares buildout statistics of the Proposed Project to the No Project/No Development Alternative. As shown in the table, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not allow any additional growth, therefore reducing potential development for dwelling units and commercial/employment uses by a substantial amount. This alternative would also reduce the number of residents and jobs by 4,153 people and 2,787 jobs, respectively, compared to the Proposed Project.

7.5.1 Aesthetics

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no new development would occur within the Project Site. Therefore, the existing visual character and resources of the Project Site would remain as is; the dwelling units and commercial/employment building square footage that would occur under the Proposed Project would not be developed. However, the various visual improvements that would be introduced throughout the Project Site under the Proposed Project (e.g., enhanced landscaping and improvements to the public realm along Long Beach Boulevard, redevelopment of underutilized sites, many existing buildings onsite are several decades old and need renovation, development projects with quality architecture,) would not occur under this alternative. For example, the Proposed Project would create a vibrant, multimodal neighborhood for residents; planned residential, commercial, and mixed-use buildings would form a consistent matrix of urban fabric that is punctuated by parklets (small street parks). The parklets would not only provide for much needed open space for communities along Long Beach Boulevard, but would also help provide visual relief in this highly urbanized area of the City. Additionally, the Proposed Project's aesthetic and visual resource impacts were determined to be less than significant. Therefore, aesthetic impacts under this alternative would be greater compared to the Proposed Project.

7.5.2 Air Quality

Under this alternative, no new development would occur, which means that no construction or demolition activities would occur either. Therefore, the Proposed Project's significant and unavoidable construction-related emissions impact would be eliminated compared to the Proposed Project.

While the Proposed Project would encourage multimodal travel and reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) through well planned development districts, operational impacts would still increase due to the allowance of new development. In comparison, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not allow any new development. By maintaining existing development throughout the Project Site, traffic and associated air emissions associated with this alternative would remain as is. Therefore, operational air quality impacts would be reduced.

Overall, air quality impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the Proposed Project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.5.3 Cultural Resources

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no new development would occur within the Project Site; this alternative would not result in the removal or alteration of any existing or potentially historical resources. Therefore, historical resources impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the Proposed Project. However, the Proposed Project's impacts to historical resources were determined to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

7.5.4 Geology and Soils

No new construction activities, including demolition and grading, would occur under the No Project/No Development Alternative. Therefore, there would be no potential for additional residents, workers, building and structures to experience seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, subsidence, or expansion throughout the Project Site. However, many buildings throughout the Project Site were built before current seismic safety codes; therefore, this alternative, by retaining older buildings, could expose people to greater hazards from strong ground shaking. Additionally, the Proposed Project's impacts to geology and soils were determined to be less than significant. Geologic hazards impacts of this alternative would be neutral to those of the Proposed Project and as with the Proposed Project, would be less than significant.

7.5.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes the Project Site is completely built out and no new development would occur. While the Proposed Project would encourage alternative modes of travel through the creation of transit node and corridor districts and by placing housing near employment, it would also allow for substantial development that would generate greater amounts of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions than existing conditions. As identified in Section 5.4, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, the Proposed Project would increase GHG emissions by 24,149 MTCO₂e annually over existing conditions. This alternative would result in a reduction of GHG emissions; however, the recent long-term GHG reduction goals under Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-30-15 would still not be met without major advancements in technology. Therefore, impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the Proposed Project but still remain significant and unavoidable.

7.5.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, the Project Site is assumed to be completely built out and no new development would occur. There would be no new potential to expose the public to hazardous materials through routine transport and use or through a possible accident do to release of hazardous materials that could occur during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Project. Additionally, the potential for asbestos-containing materials and lead based paint to be released during the demolition of building and structures under the Proposed Project would not occur, as no new development would occur under this alternative. Furthermore, existing hazardous emissions or uses would remain as is and would be required to continue complying with existing state and local regulations. Therefore, impacts of this alternative would be reduced compared to the Proposed Project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.5.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

Existing water quality conditions, groundwater supplies, drainage patterns, and runoff water amounts would remain as is under this alternative as no new development would occur. This alternative would not introduce new sources of water pollutants (from either construction or operations phases of development projects) to the Project Site, as no new development would occur. Additionally, this alternative would not require the storm drain facility improvements that would be required under the Proposed Project. However, this alternative would not include the development of new low-impact development (LID), source control, site design, and treatment control best management practices (BMPs) to minimize runoff and water pollution, which would occur under the Proposed Project. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts would be reduced under this alternative, and would be less than significant without the mitigation outlined for the Proposed Project.

7.5.8 Land Use and Planning

Given that the Midtown Specific Plan would not be adopted, this alternative would not require a general plan amendment or zone change. The existing PD-29 designation of the Project Site would remain and development would occur consistent with the City's General Plan land use and zoning designations. However, this alternative would not provide a catalyst for revitalizing the Long Beach Boulevard corridor, including new open space areas, increased housing near employment areas, an enhanced medical district, and transit oriented development near the existing Metro Blue Line stations. New development standards and design guidelines to enhance the character, mobility, and streetscape of the Project Site would also not be implemented. Additionally, the Proposed Project's impacts to land use and planning were determined to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, overall land use impacts of the No Project/No Development Alternative compared to the Proposed Project would be neutral to those of the Proposed Project and as with the Proposed Project, would be less than significant.

7.5.9 Noise

Under this alternative, no new development would occur. Therefore, this alternative would eliminate the Proposed Project's significant and unavoidable noise impacts related to construction activities. Additionally, no new operational noises would be generated given that no development would occur under this alternative. Therefore, impacts would be reduced under this alternative and would be less than significant without the mitigation outlined for the Proposed Project.

7.5.10 Population and Housing

Population growth would not occur under the No Project/No Development Alternative because no new homes, businesses, roads, or other infrastructure would be proposed. Population in the Project Site would remain as is under this alternative. In comparison to this alternative, the Proposed Project would result in an increase in population in the City by 4,179 residents and housing by 1,736 units. However, the Proposed Project's impacts to population and housing were determined to be less than significant. Nonetheless, population and housing impacts would be reduced under this alternative compared to the Proposed Project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.5.11 Public Services

Existing population, housing, commercial/employment use, and workers in the Project Site would remain under this alternative. Therefore, there would be no increase in demand for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or libraries. In comparison, the Proposed Project would increase the Project Site's housing by 1,736 units, population by 4,179 residents, commercial/employment uses by 368,935 square feet, and workers by 2,787. However, the Proposed Project's impacts to population and housing were determined to be less than significant. Nonetheless, public services impacts would be reduced under this alternative compared to the Proposed Project.

7.5.12 Recreation

While this alternative would not implement the proposed parklets along Long Beach Boulevard, no additional residents or employees would be introduced into the Project Site that may increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities in the City. However, the Proposed Project's impacts on parks and recreational facilities were determined to be less than significant. Overall, impacts to parks and recreational facilities would be slightly reduced under this alternative compared to the Proposed Project.

7.5.13 Transportation and Traffic

Under this alternative, no new housing units, residents, employees, or commercial/employment uses would be introduced into the Project Site. Existing daily trips would remain similar to current conditions and all roadway segments and intersections would maintain existing levels of service. As detailed in Section 5.12, *Transportation and Traffic*, all study area intersections currently operate and acceptable level of service (LOS D or better) during peak hours under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be reduced under this alternative and would be less than significant without the mitigation measures outlined for the Proposed Project.

7.5.14 Utilities and Service Systems

No new development and population increase under this alternative would mean that existing water supply demand in the Project Site would remain the same, and wastewater, and solid waste would also remain the same. In comparison, the Proposed Project would introduce 1,736 additional homes and 368,935 square feet of commercial/employment uses, which would substantially increase water supply demands, and also increase wastewater and solid waste generation. Therefore, impacts to utilities and service system would be reduced under this alternative and would be less than significant without the mitigation outlined for the Proposed Project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.5.15 Conclusion

Ability to Reduce Impacts

The No Project/No Development Alternative would reduce impacts to air quality (operation), cultural resources, GHG, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise (operation), population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. Additionally, significant and unavoidable impacts associated with construction- and operational related air quality and construction-related noise would be eliminated under this alternative. However, impacts related to aesthetics would be increased under this alternative, and the significant and unavoidable GHG impact associated with the Proposed Project would not be eliminated.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would ultimately stop any new development from occurring within the Project Site beyond what is already on the ground. Therefore, none of the project objectives would be achieved under this alternative. There would be no improvements to enhance mobility and implement complete streets principles (Guiding Principle No. 1); streets and connections between the medical area, parks, and neighborhoods would not be enhanced with safety and wellness features (Guiding Principle No. 2); and infrastructure and amenities would remain as is (Guiding Principle No. 4). Further, since no development would occur, a sustainable future decreasing reliance on automobiles, reducing the urban heat-island effect, and promoting a balance of jobs and housing would not be achieved (Guiding Principle No. 3). Lastly, the ideas and plans within the Midtown Specific Plan that were generated by the City and community (i.e., residents, businesses, property owners, and interest groups) would not be implemented (Guiding Principle No. 5).

7.6 NO PROJECT/EXISTING ZONING ALTERNATIVE

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative assumes that the Midtown Specific Plan would not be adopted and the current zoning designation of the overall Project Site (Planned Development District 29 [PD-29]) would remain. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A), where a project is the revision of an existing regulatory plan, the “no project” alternative assumes continuation of the existing plan, policy or operation into the future. Therefore, this alternative assumes that new development and redevelopment would continue to occur in the Project Site consistent with the provisions of the adopted PD-29 zoning designation of the Project Site. As shown in Table 7-1, *Build-out Statistical Summary*, the existing zoning designation of the Project Site would allow for substantially more dwelling units and commercial/employment building square footage that would occur under the Proposed Project. Overall development for the Project Site under current the zoning would allow for a total of 5,922 dwelling units and 5,045,077 commercial/employment building square footage, which would generate approximately 17,161 residents and 20,471 jobs.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.6.1 Aesthetics

Under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative, future development would occur in accordance with the provisions (e.g., development standards and guidelines) of PD-29 zoning designation. Compared to the Proposed Project, this alternative would introduce approximately 2,200 more dwelling units and 2.0 million square feet more of nonresidential development. Most of the additional residential and nonresidential development would occur in the Midtown Specific Plan area of the Project Site. Therefore, the Project Site would experience more intense development than would occur under the Proposed Project. New development under this alternative would not include implementation of the development districts of the Midtown Specific Plan, which emphasize transit-oriented development, multimodal transit opportunities, a strong employment center, and open space areas. Mobility and streetscape enhancements under the Midtown Specific Plan would also not be implemented under this alternative. Therefore, aesthetic impacts under this alternative would be greater than those of the Proposed Project.

7.6.2 Air Quality

This alternative would allow for approximately 2,200 more dwelling units and 2.0 million square feet more of nonresidential development compared to the Proposed Project. The additional development would substantially increase emissions of criteria air pollutants from construction and operational activities and would exceed SCAQMD's regional operational significance threshold more than that of the Proposed Project. The increase in development could also increase construction activities and related emissions near sensitive receptors. Therefore, air quality impacts would be greater under this alternative and remain significant and unavoidable.

7.6.3 Cultural Resources

Compared to the Proposed Project, the amount of density and intensity of development would increase under this alternative. However, development under this alternative would impact the same properties that would be impacted under the Proposed Project. Therefore, as with the Proposed Project, development under this alternative could result in an impact on known and/or unknown historical resources. Under this alternative and the Proposed Project, potential impacts to historical resources would be significant without mitigation. Therefore, historical resources impacts under this alternative would be similar to those of the Proposed Project, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

7.6.4 Geology and Soils

Geology and soils impacts would be greater under this alternative as there would be a substantial increase in allowable residential and nonresidential development, approximately 2,200 dwelling units and 2.0 million square feet of commercial/employment uses, which would result in an increase in population and workers. Overall, the development area would be similar, but the additional development intensity and increase in population and workers under this alternative would increase the potential for buildings and persons to experience geological and seismic hazards, including strong ground shaking, liquefaction, subsidence, or soil expansion. Under this alternative and the Proposed Project, potential impacts related to geology and soils

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

would be less than significant without mitigation. However, geology and soils impacts would be greater under this alternative.

7.6.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would substantially increase development and associated vehicle miles traveled and GHG emissions from stationary and mobile sources. Additionally, the guiding principles and goals of the Midtown Specific Plan related to complete streets (i.e., pedestrian friendly streets, alternative modes of transportation, etc.) would not be implemented under this alternative. Therefore, GHG impacts would be greater under this scenario and remain significant and unavoidable.

7.6.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Past and present uses and activities within the Project Site have known or suspected contamination of soils. Development and redevelopment in accordance with the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in similar impacts related to the presence of known or suspected on-site contamination. As with the Proposed Project, future development under this alternative has the potential to be exposed to suspected sites, and demolition activities may expose construction workers to asbestos containing materials or lead based paints. This alternative would result in similar impacts (less than significant) related to hazards and hazardous materials when compared to the Proposed Project.

7.6.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

Development in accordance with the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would result in greater amounts of impervious surfaces compared to the Proposed Project. This alternative would allow for approximately 2,200 additional dwelling units and approximately 2.0 million additional square feet of commercial/employment uses in the Project Site. Short-term construction-related and long-term operational-related water quality impacts would be similar to the Proposed Project since development projects under this alternative would be required to comply with the Construction General Permit and the City's MS4 Permit, (i.e., implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and Water Quality Management Plan). However, this alternative would result in an increase in the volume and/or velocity of stormwater because the additional development would result in less impervious surfaces throughout the Project Site. Additionally, this alternative would result in a greater impact to the City's drainage system compared to the Proposed Project, which as proposed, requires mitigation for a number of drainage improvements. As a result of the additional development that would occur under this alternative, the amount and type of drainage improvements would most likely increase. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts would be greater under this alternative.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.6.8 Land Use and Planning

Given that the Midtown Specific Plan would not be adopted, this alternative would not require a general plan amendment or zone change. The existing PD-29 designation of the Project Site would remain and development would occur consistent with the City's General Plan land use and zoning designations. However, this alternative would not implement a number of beneficial elements that would occur under the Proposed Project, including enhancements to the corridor's mobility and streetscape, design guidelines promoting quality design and creativity, complete streets network, and development in accordance with the proposed development districts of the Midtown Specific Plan (i.e., Transit Node, Corridor, Medical and Open Space Districts). Overall, land use impacts would be greater under this alternative.

7.6.9 Noise

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would allow for up to 2,200 dwelling more units and 2.0 million square feet more of nonresidential development compared to the Proposed Project. Therefore, the additional development would result in an increase in noise associated with construction activities more so than the Proposed Project. Intensified stationary noise sources related to new nonresidential development would also increase noise levels at adjacent properties. Additionally, operational traffic-related noise would increase under this alternative because more dwelling units, residents, businesses, and employees would be generated under this alternative compared to the Proposed Project. Overall, noise impacts would be greater under this alternative, and construction noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

7.6.10 Population and Housing

Compared to the Proposed Project, this alternative would result in approximately 4,700 additional employees due to the increase in approximately 2.0 million square feet of commercial/employment uses. This alternative would also allow up to 2,200 more dwelling units, which would result in a population increase of almost 7,000 people. As a result, the jobs-housing balance under this alternative would be less jobs-rich (3.46) compared to the Proposed Project (4.23), as shown in Table 7-1, *Build-out Statistical Summary*. SCAG considers an area balanced when the jobs-housing ratio is 1.36; communities with more than 1.36 jobs per dwelling unit are considered jobs-rich; those with fewer than 1.36 are housing-rich. While this alternative would help the City achieve a more balanced jobs-housing ratio, the population, housing, and nonresidential development increase would be much more substantial than the Proposed Project. Therefore, population and housing impacts would be greater under this alternative.

7.6.11 Public Services

Development intensity would be greater under this alternative and would allow for approximately 2,200 more dwelling units, which would result in a population increase of almost 7,000 people; this alternative would also result in approximately 4,700 additional employees due to the increase in approximately 2.0 million square feet of commercial/employment uses. The substantial increase in permitted development, population and employment would increase overall demand for police and fire protection, schools, and library services. Therefore, public services impacts would be greater under this alternative.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.6.12 Recreation

Similar to public services impacts, recreation impacts would also be greater given the substantial increase in residents compared to the Proposed Project. Under this alternative, the almost 7,000 additional residents would lead to greater demand and future deterioration of existing parks and recreational facilities. The proposed parklets along Long Beach Boulevard that would occur under the Proposed Project would also not be implemented under this alternative. Therefore, impacts would be greater under this alternative.

7.6.13 Transportation and Traffic

This alternative would allow substantially more residential and nonresidential development to occur compared to the Proposed Project. The substantial increase in development would increase the number of vehicle trips generated within the Project Site and beyond the site boundaries. In addition, the traffic impact analysis prepared for the Proposed Project details that implementation of existing zoning (no project) would result in three intersections operating at LOS E or F by 2035. Without mitigation, the impacts at all three intersection would be significant and unavoidable. Under the Proposed Project, mitigation measures (which would not be available to this alternative) would reduce the impacts at all three intersections to a level of less than significant. Furthermore, this alternative would not implement a number of beneficial elements that would occur under the Proposed Project, including enhancements to the corridor's mobility and streetscape and complete streets network. Therefore, transportation and traffic impacts would be greater under this alternative.

7.6.14 Utilities and Service Systems

Under this alternative, substantially more residential and nonresidential development to occur compared to the Proposed Project. The additional development would lead to an increase in water supply, natural gas, and electricity demand and in the generation of wastewater and solid waste. Additional development under this alternative would also lead to the increase in impervious surfaces in the Project Site compared to the proposed project, which would likely have a greater effect on the storm drainage capacity in the area due to increased stormwater runoff. Therefore, impacts to utilities and service systems would be greater under this alternative.

7.6.15 Conclusion

Ability to Reduce Impacts

Under this alternative, no impacts would be reduced compared to the Proposed Project. In fact, impacts related to aesthetics, air quality (construction and operations), geology and soils, GHG emissions, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise (construction and operations), population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic and utilities and service systems would be greater. Impacts related to cultural resources and hazards and hazardous materials would be similar. Additionally, significant and unavoidable impacts associated with construction- and operational related air quality, construction-related noise, and GHG emissions would not be eliminated under this alternative.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative may achieve some of the Proposed Project's guiding principles; however, those that it may achieve, it would not achieve them to the degree of the Proposed Project. This alternative would not enhance mobility and complete streets (Guiding Principle No. 1); improve safety and wellness through the use of well-designed streets and connections (Guiding Principle No. 2); create a sustainable future through decreased automobile reliance and urban heat-island effect (Guiding Principle No. 3); support new infrastructure and amenities to create an enjoyable place to live and work (Guiding Principle No. 4); or strengthen coordination efforts and ties with the communities' residents, businesses, and property owners (Guiding Principle No. 5). Future development under this alternative would occur in accordance with existing zoning designation of the Project Site and would not include the many benefits that would be provided under the Proposed Project, including complete streets and improved health and wellness.

7.7 REDUCED INTENSITY/DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

Under the Reduced Intensity/Density Alternative, development in the Project Site would occur at much lower intensities and would focus residential growth in the Transit Node Districts. A comparison of overall buildout summaries of the Proposed Project and the Reduced Intensity/Density Alternative is provided in Table 7-1, *Build-out Statistical Summary*. As shown in this table, development under this alternative compared to the Proposed Project would be reduced by 900 dwelling units and 650,000 square feet of commercial/employment uses; population and employment numbers would also decrease under this alternative. More specifically, buildout of the Medical District would be reduced by 300 units; Corridor District 2 would be reduced by 300 units and 100,000 square feet of commercial/employment uses; Transit Node District 5 would be reduced by 300 units and 350,000 square feet of commercial/employment uses; and Transit Node Districts 6 and 7 would each be reduced by 100,000 square feet of commercial/employment uses. The areas outside the Midtown Specific Plan Area would have the same buildout potential as the Proposed Project.

7.7.1 Aesthetics

Under this alternative, the density and intensity of development would be reduced by a total of 900 units and 650,000 square feet of commercial/employment uses within the Medical District, Corridor District 2, and Transit Node Districts 5, 6, and 7. Given that less development would occur, this alternative would less drastically change the existing visual character and contribute fewer new sources of light and glare to the Project Site. Therefore, aesthetic impacts would be reduced under this alternative.

7.7.2 Air Quality

This alternative would decrease allowable residential, commercial/employment uses in the Project Site, thereby also decreasing construction and operation emissions compared to the Proposed Project. However, there is still potential for multiple developments to be constructed at any one time; therefore, significant construction-related emissions would occur. Additionally, while operation-related criteria air pollutant generated from stationary and mobile sources would decrease due to the reduced intensity and density of this

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

alternative, impacts would still be significant and unavoidable. Existing sensitive receptors may still be close to project-related construction activities as well. Similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would still represent a substantial increase in emissions compared to existing conditions and would exceed SCAQMD's regional operational significance threshold, making it inconsistent with the AQMP. Overall, impacts to air quality would slightly decrease; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

7.7.3 Cultural Resources

Compared to the Proposed Project, the amount of density and intensity of development would decrease under this alternative. However, development under this alternative would impact the same properties that would be impacted under the Proposed Project. Therefore, as with the Proposed Project, development under this alternative could result in an impact on known and/or unknown historical resources. Under this alternative and the Proposed Project, potential impacts to historical resources would be significant without mitigation. Therefore, historical resources impacts under this alternative would be similar to those of the Proposed Project, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

7.7.4 Geology and Soils

Geology and soils impacts related to seismic groundshaking, liquefaction, subsidence, and soil expansion would be less than those that would occur under the Proposed Project because development would be less dense and intense under this alternative. By decreasing development potential, existing geology and soil conditions would be less impacted by construction and grading activities. Therefore, geology and soils impacts under this alternative would be reduced.

7.7.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The reduced development of 900 dwelling units and 650,000 square feet of commercial/employment uses under this alternative would result in a reduction in vehicular trips and VMT by residents, workers, and visitors in the Project Site. This would lead to a decrease in GHG emissions compared to the Proposed Project. With implementation of the applicable mitigation measures of the Proposed Project, additional statewide measures would still be necessary to reduce GHG emissions to meet the long-term GHG reduction goals under Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-30-15. At this time, there is no plan past 2020 that achieves the long-term GHG reduction goal established under Executive Order S-3-05 or the new Executive Order B-30-15. Therefore, although GHG emissions would be slightly reduced under this alternative, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

7.7.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be reduced under this alternative compared to that of the Proposed Project due to the lower numbers of residents that could be exposed to hazardous materials that could be present in site soils. In addition, the decrease in development capacity of commercial/employment square footage also reduces the potential for hazardous material transport, use, disposal, accidental release,

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

and/or emissions into the environment. Therefore, hazards and hazardous materials impacts under this alternative would be reduced.

7.7.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would decrease potential development capacity by 900 units and 650,000 square feet of commercial/employment uses. This would result in the reduction of the construction of impervious surfaces and associated volume of stormwater runoff. Therefore, while development under this alternative would still be required to comply with state regulations related to Construction General Permits, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans, and Water Quality Management Plans, short-term construction-related and long-term water quality would be reduced compared to the Proposed Project.

7.7.8 Land Use and Planning

This alternative would require all of the discretionary permits required for the Proposed Project by the City of Long Beach. As with the Proposed Project, a zone change and General Plan amendment would be required. Therefore, land use and planning impacts of this alternative would be similar to those of the Proposed Project.

7.7.9 Noise

Construction and operation noise impacts would be reduced under this alternative because of the reduction in development intensity and density. There would be less construction activities because residential and nonresidential development would decrease by 900 dwelling units and 650,000 square feet, respectively. Nevertheless, construction noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because of the potential proximity to sensitive uses and potential longevity of construction activities. Operational noise impacts would also be reduced under this alternative as traffic-generated and stationary noise sources would decrease due to the reduction in residential and nonresidential development. Overall, noise impacts under this alternative would be reduced.

7.7.10 Population and Housing

Compared to the Proposed Project, this alternative would result in the reduction of housing units and commercial/employment uses, which would correlate to a reduction of population by 2,453 residents and employment by 1,053 jobs. The jobs-housing ratio under this alternative would be 5.22 while the Proposed Project would generate a ratio of 4.23. While the population and housing would decrease under this alternative, the jobs-housing ratio would become more jobs rich than the Proposed Project. As noted earlier, SCAG considers an area balanced when the jobs-housing ratio is 1.36. Therefore, this alternative would not help the City achieve a more balanced jobs-housing ratio compared to the Proposed Project. Therefore, population and housing impacts under this alternative would be similar to those of the Proposed Project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.7.11 Public Services

Public services impacts would decrease under this alternative as a result in the reduction of dwelling units and commercial/employment uses, and the correlating reduction in population and employment, respectively. These reductions would result in less demand for fire and police protection (i.e., fewer calls for service), school services due to a reduced student population, and library services due to an overall population reduction. Therefore, public service impacts under this alternative would be reduced.

7.7.12 Recreation

Compared to the Proposed Project, this alternative would reduce the number of dwelling units by 900, which would correlate to a reduction in residents. By decreasing the population increase, demands on parks and recreational facilities would be reduced and impacts to existing facilities would also be lessened. A decrease in population also reduces the need to provide additional acres of parkland or recreational opportunities in the Project Site to comply with the City's parkland standard of 8 acres per 1,000 residents. Therefore, recreation impacts under this alternative would be reduced.

7.7.13 Transportation and Traffic

This alternative would decrease the number of dwelling units by 900 and the amount of commercial/employment uses by 650,000. This would greatly reduce the number of vehicle trips generated and thereby, result in fewer trips at the study area intersections and roadways. However, no significant traffic impacts were identified for the Proposed Project. Overall, transportation and traffic impacts would be reduced under this alternative.

7.7.14 Utilities and Service Systems

Under this alternative, impacts on utilities and service systems would be reduced compared to the Proposed Project do to the decrease in residential and nonresidential development that would occur. The reduction in development would result in a decreased demand in water, natural gas, and electricity supply, and decreased generation of wastewater and solid waste in the Project Site. Therefore, utilities and service systems impacts would be reduced under this alternative.

7.7.15 Conclusion

Ability to Reduce Impacts

This alternative would reduce impacts related to aesthetics, air quality (construction and operation), geology and soils, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise (construction and operation), public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. Impacts would be similar for cultural resources, land use and planning, and population and housing. However, significant and unavoidable impacts associated with construction- and operational related air quality, construction-related noise, and GHG emissions would not be eliminated under this alternative.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

Under the Reduced Intensity/Density Alternative, most of the Proposed Project's guiding principles would be achieved. The guiding principles that would be met include enhanced mobility and complete streets (Guiding Principle No. 1); create a healthy, safe, and connected urban neighborhoods along Long Beach Boulevard (Guiding Principle No. 2); support a sustainable future by decreasing automobile reliance and the urban heat-island effect (Guiding Principle No. 3); and improve infrastructure and amenities (e.g. bike and pedestrian facilities, parklets, landscaping, etc.; Guiding Principle No. 4). However, the reduction in development capacity under this alternative would not be consistent with the ideas and plans presented in the Proposed Project, which were generated through close coordination with existing residents, businesses, property owners, and development communities (Guiding Principle No. 5).

7.8 RESIDENTIAL FOCUS ALTERNATIVE

Under the Residential Focus Alternative, new development would be predominantly residential and occur in the Corridor and Transit Node Districts of the Midtown Specific Plan area. It is assumed that the majority of new development would be single-use and would not contain a high percentage of mixed-use/nonresidential space. A comparison of overall buildout summaries of the Proposed Project and the Residential Focus Alternative is provided in Table 7-1, *Build-out Statistical Summary*. As shown in this table, development under this alternative compared to the Proposed Project would be reduced by 300 dwelling units and nearly 800,000 square feet of commercial/employment uses; population and employment numbers would also decrease under this alternative. More specifically, the Medical District would be reduced by 300 dwelling units; Transit Node District 5 would be reduced by 600,000 square feet of commercial/employment uses; and Transit Node Districts 6 and 7 would each be reduced by 100,000 square feet of commercial/employment uses. All other Midtown Specific Plan districts and the two areas outside the Midtown Specific Plan area would have the same buildout potential as the Proposed Project.

7.8.1 Aesthetics

Under the Residential Focus Alternative, the number of dwelling units and commercial/employment uses would be reduced by 300 units and nearly 800,000 square feet, respectively, compared to the Proposed Project. The reduced development would result in a reduction in the number and height of buildings and structures in the Project Site. Additionally, less development would correlate into the reduction in the amount of light and glare that would be created throughout the Project Site and its surroundings. Therefore, aesthetics impacts would be reduced under this alternative.

7.8.2 Air Quality

This alternative would result in a reduction of air quality impacts compared to the Proposed Project do to the reduction in development potential. However, construction-related impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, as the construction activities of multiple projects at a time would generate significant construction-related emissions and may occur near existing sensitive receptors. Additionally, since some existing operational emissions already exceed SCAQMD's regional significance threshold, new development

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

at any density or land use type would still exceed the threshold and make this alternative inconsistent with the AQMP. Therefore, while air quality impacts would be slightly reduced, they would remain significant and unavoidable.

7.8.3 Cultural Resources

Compared to the Proposed Project, the number of dwelling units and commercial/employment uses would be reduced under this alternative. However, development under this alternative would impact the same properties that would be impacted under the Proposed Project. Therefore, as with the Proposed Project, development under this alternative could result in an impact on known and/or unknown historical resources. Under this alternative and the Proposed Project, potential impacts to historical resources would be significant without mitigation. Therefore, historical resources impacts under this alternative would be similar to those of the Proposed Project, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

7.8.4 Geology and Soils

By significantly reducing development in the Project Site, geology and soils impacts would be reduced since less construction activities would disturb existing geologic conditions. Additionally, fewer buildings, structures, residents, and workers would be exposed to potential risks related to seismic groundshaking, subsidence, soil expansion, and liquefaction. Therefore, geology and soils impacts would be reduced under this alternative.

7.8.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This reduction in residential and nonresidential development under this alternative would result in a reduction in vehicular trips and VMT by residents, workers, and visitors in the Project Site. However, as stated above, there are no current plans past 2020 that would achieve the long-term GHG reduction goals established under Executive Orders S-3-05 or B-30-15. Therefore, while GHG emissions would be reduced under this scenario, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

7.8.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would focus development on residential uses rather than commercial/employment uses. Given that residential uses generally use less hazardous materials than commercial/employment uses, the potential for hazards and hazardous materials use and exposure would be reduced under this alternative. The decrease in residential development would also lower the number of residents in the Project Site that could be exposed to hazardous materials that may be present in site soils. Therefore, hazards and hazardous materials impacts under this alternative would be reduced.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.8.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

The reduction in residential and commercial/employment uses under this alternative (300 less dwelling units and nearly 800,000 square feet less of commercial/employment uses) would substantially reduce construction- and operational-related water quality impacts. This alternative would also result in the decrease in the amount of impervious surfaces and stormwater runoff volumes due to fewer buildings and related hardscape improvements. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts would be reduced under this alternative.

7.8.8 Land Use and Planning

Similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would require the same discretionary approvals, which include a zone change and General Plan amendment. Other policies in the Midtown Specific Plan would also be implemented under this alternative. Therefore, land use impacts would be similar under this alternative.

7.8.9 Noise

Construction- and operation-related noise impacts would be significantly reduced under this alternative given that there would be a reduction of 300 dwelling units and nearly 800,000 square feet of commercial/employment uses. However, construction-related noise could still be in proximity to sensitive receptors and the longevity of the construction activities is uncertain. Therefore, although overall construction and operation noise impacts would be reduced under this alternative, construction noise impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

7.8.10 Population and Housing

Under this alternative, population buildout would be reduced by 800 residents and dwelling units would decrease by 300 units. By significantly reducing the amount of commercial/employment uses, employment would also decrease by 1,453 jobs. Therefore, the jobs-housing ratio would slightly decrease to 4.18 under this alternative compared to the Proposed Project's ratio of 4.23. The slight reduction in jobs-housing ratio is beneficial for the Project Site because it makes it slightly less jobs-rich. As noted earlier, SCAG considers an area balanced when the jobs-housing ratio is 1.36. However, the ratio difference is nominal and would still result in a very jobs-rich environment likely due to the jobs in the Medical District. Overall, impacts to population and housing would be reduced under this alternative.

7.8.11 Public Services

Public services impacts would decrease under this alternative as a result in the reduction of dwelling units and commercial/employment uses, and the correlating reduction in population and employment, respectively. These reductions would result in less demand for fire and police protection (i.e., fewer calls for service), school services due to a reduced student population, and library services due to an overall population reduction. Therefore, public service impacts under this alternative would be reduced.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.8.12 Recreation

Compared to the Proposed Project, this alternative would reduce the number of dwelling units by 900, which would correlate to a reduction in residents. By decreasing the population increase, demands on parks and recreational facilities would be reduced and impacts to existing facilities would also be lessened. A decrease in population also reduces the need to provide additional acres of parkland or recreational opportunities in the Project Site to comply with the City's parkland standard of 8 acres per 1,000 residents. Therefore, recreation impacts under this alternative would be reduced.

7.8.13 Transportation and Traffic

This alternative would substantially reduce buildout by 300 dwelling units and 800,000 square feet of commercial/employment uses, which would lead to a reduction in vehicle trip generation. The reduction in vehicle trips would result in reduced impacts on levels of service for various intersections within the Project Site. However, no significant traffic impacts were identified for the Proposed Project. Overall, transportation and traffic impacts would be reduced under this alternative.

7.8.14 Utilities and Service Systems

By reducing dwelling units and commercial/employment uses under this alternative, demand for water supply, natural gas, and electricity would be reduced and the generation of solid waste and wastewater would also be reduced. Therefore, impacts to utilities and service systems would be reduced under this alternative.

7.8.15 Conclusion

Ability to Reduce Impacts

Under this alternative, impacts to aesthetics, air quality (construction and operation), geology and soils, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise (construction and operation), population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems would be reduced. Impacts related to cultural resources and land use and planning would be similar. However, significant and unavoidable impacts associated with construction- and operational related air quality, construction-related noise, and GHG emissions would not be eliminated under this alternative.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

The Residential Focus Alternative would be able to achieve a majority of the project objectives. Similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would meet the Proposed Project's guiding principles related to mobility, complete streets, multimodal opportunities, and safety and health designs along the corridor (Guiding Principle's No. 1 and 2). Supporting infrastructure and amenities would also be provided to attract new development and create an enjoyable place to live, work, and visit (Guiding Principle No. 4). However, by substantially reducing the amount of commercial/employment uses in the Project Site and focusing more on residential development, this alternative may not be able to achieve as economically sustainable of a future as the Proposed Project would since employment and business opportunities would be greatly reduced (Guiding

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Principle No. 3). In addition, a residential-focused alternative would not be consistent with the ideas and plans generated by the existing community related to development and improvements with Long Beach Memorial and other medical facilities within and surrounding the Medical District (Guiding Principle No. 5).

7.9 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires a lead agency to identify the “environmentally superior alternative” when significant environmental impacts result from the Proposed Project. In cases where the “No Project” Alternative is environmentally superior to the Proposed Project, an environmentally superior development alternative must be identified. Table 7-2 provides, in summary format, a comparison of the level of impacts for each alternative in comparison to the Proposed Project. In addition, Table 7-3 provides a comparison of the ability of each of the alternatives to meet the guiding principles established for the Proposed Project.

Table 7-2 Summary of Impacts of Alternatives Compared to the Proposed Project

Topic	Proposed Project	No Project/No Development Alternative	No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative	Reduced Intensity/Density Alternative	Residential Focus Alternative
Aesthetics	LTS	(+)	(+)	(-)	(-)
Air Quality					
<i>Construction</i>	S/U	(-)*	(+)	(-)	(-)
<i>Operation</i>	S/U	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)
Cultural Resources	LTS/M	(-)	(=)	(=)	(=)
Geology and Soils	LTS	(=)	(+)	(-)	(-)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	S/U	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LTS/M	(-)	(=)	(-)	(-)
Hydrology and Water Quality	LTS/M	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)
Land Use and Planning	LTS	(=)	(+)	(=)	(=)
Noise					
<i>Construction</i>	S/U	(-)*	(+)	(-)	(-)
<i>Operation</i>	LTS/M	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)
Population and Housing	LTS	(-)	(+)	(=)	(-)
Public Services	LTS	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)
Recreation	LTS	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)
Transportation/Traffic	LTS/M	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)
Utilities and Service Systems	LTS/M	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)

Notes: LTS: Less than Significant; LTS/M: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated; SU: Significant and Unavoidable

* Eliminates a significant and unavoidable impact.

(-) The alternative would result in less of an impact than the Proposed Project.

(+) The alternative would result in greater impacts than the Proposed Project.

(=) The alternative would result in the same/similar impacts as the Proposed Project.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Table 7-3 Ability of Each Alternative to Meet the Proposed Project's Guiding Principle

Guiding Principle	Land Use Alternatives				
	Proposed Project	No Project/No Development Alternative	No Project/ Existing Zoning Alternative	Reduced Intensity/Density Alternative	Residential Focus Alternative
Enhanced Mobility and Complete Streets. Long Beach Boulevard must evolve to prioritize and enhance the walkability of the corridor, improve mobility options for bicycles and transit riders, and preserve functionality of the corridor as a thoroughfare for automobiles. The addition of trees, landscape, furnishings, and bike lanes; improved pedestrian crossings; and small changes in travel lanes will enhance the public realm experience for all users.	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Safety and Wellness. The physical environment plays a critical role in our community's overall health. Providing active and passive park spaces for urban neighborhoods along Long Beach Boulevard is critical to improve health and wellness. A well-designed street creates a safer and more appealing setting for families, bicyclists, and others along the corridor. Additionally, the Plan proposes physical and programmatic connections between health-related institutions, park areas, and the public right-of-way.	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
A Sustainable Future. The City of Long Beach supports a sustainable future for its residents, its businesses, and the environment. The Midtown area should improve and develop in a sustainable manner by decreasing the reliance on automobiles, reducing the urban heat-island effect, and promoting a balance of jobs and housing.	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Supporting Urban Amenities. The supporting amenities serving Midtown must be improved to stimulate reinvestment and attract new development. Midtown must be an enjoyable place to live and do business. Improvements and new development will seek out urban amenities such as attractive rights-of-way, safe and efficient bikeway and pedestrian facilities, parks and parklets, and landscaping enhancements.	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Working with and for the Community. The ideas and plans presented in this specific plan were generated by close coordination with the existing resident, business, property owner, and development communities. Working with and for the community does not stop after the adoption of the plan. This plan places special emphasis on coordinating public and private improvements and programming with Long Beach Memorial and other medical facilities in Midtown.	Yes	No	No	No	No

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Based on the preceding analysis and the summaries provided in Tables 7-2 and 7-3, the Residential Focus Alternative has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative. As shown in Table 7-2, this alternative would reduce impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality (construction and operation), geology and soils, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise (construction and operation), population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. Cultural resources and land use and planning impacts are generally the same as the Proposed Project.

Each of these impacts, however, would be less than significant (not requiring mitigation) or mitigated to less than significant under the Proposed Project. Additionally, significant and unavoidable impacts associated with construction- and operational related air quality, construction-related noise, and GHG emissions would not be eliminated under this alternative. Furthermore, as shown in Table 7-3, the Residential Focus Alternative would not meet two of the Proposed Project's guiding principles, providing a sustainable future (Guiding Principle No. 3) and working with and for the community (Guiding Principle No. 5).