

5.0 ALTERNATIVES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

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” (*State 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 *State CEQA Guidelines* on alternatives (Section 15126.6(b) 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 that 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 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 the ‘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. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project. The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making. 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)).

- 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)).
- If the lead agency concludes that no feasible alternative locations exist, it must disclose the reasons for this conclusion, and should include the reasons in the EIR. For example, in some cases there may be no feasible alternative locations for a geothermal plant or mining Project, which must be in close proximity to natural resources at a given location (15126.6(f)(2)(B)).
- An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative (15126.6(f)(3)).

Pursuant to the guidelines stated above, a range of alternatives to the proposed Project is considered and evaluated in this EIR. These alternatives were developed in the course of Project planning and environmental review. The discussion in this section provides the following:

- A description of the alternatives considered.
- Comparative analysis of each alternative that focuses on the potentially significant unavoidable environmental impacts of the proposed Project, e.g., global climate change. The purpose of this analysis is to determine whether alternatives are capable of eliminating or reducing the significant environmental impacts of the Project to a less than significant level.
- Conclusions regarding the alternative's: (1) ability to avoid or substantially lessen the significant unavoidable impacts of the Project; (2) ability to attain the Project objectives (as stated below); and (3) merits of each alternative compared to the merits of the proposed Project.

5.1.1 Project Objectives

The primary goal of the proposed Project is to replace the former Belmont Pool complex with a state-of-the-art aquatic facility to continue to serve as a recreational and competitive venue for the community, the City of Long Beach (City), the region, and the State. The specific objectives of the Project are to:

1. Redevelop the City-owned site of the former Belmont Pool with similar aquatic recreational purposes, consistent with the original ballot measure;
2. Replace the former Belmont Pool with a more modern facility that better meets the needs of the local community, region and State's recreational and competitive swimmers, divers, aquatic sports participants, and additional pool users due to the tremendous demand for these services in the local community, region and State;
3. Minimize the time period that the community is without a permanent recreation and competitive pool facility;
4. Provide a facility that supports recreation, training, and all competitive events for up to 4,250 spectators (1,250 permanent interior seats, up to 3,000 temporary exterior seats);

5. Increase programmable water space for recreational swimming to minimize scheduling conflicts with team practices and events;
6. Provide a signature design in a new pool complex that is distinctive, yet appropriate for its seaside location;
7. Accommodate swimming, diving, and water polo national/international events by reflecting current competitive standards, in accordance with FINA regulations;
8. Operate a pool facility that would generate revenue to help offset the ongoing operations and maintenance costs;
9. Implement the land use goals of Planned Development PD-2;
10. Provide a facility that maximizes sustainability and energy efficiency through the use of selected high performance materials;
11. Minimize view disruptions compared to the former Belmont Pool facility;
12. Maximize views to the ocean from inside the facility;
13. Locate the pool in an area that serves the existing users;
14. Design the passive open space with drought tolerant and/or native landscaping and include areas suitable for general community use; and
15. Maintain or increase the amount of open space compared to the former Belmont Pool facility.

5.1.2 Significant Unavoidable Impacts of the Proposed Project

As discussed in detail in Chapter 4.0, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, the proposed Project would not result in significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, recreation, transportation and circulation, and utilities and service systems. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that all of the alternatives would comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations, policies, and ordinances. It is also assumed that all design features, standard conditions, and mitigation measures required to reduce impacts associated with Project implementation would also apply to the Project alternatives and that similar reductions in impacts would be achieved through such design features, standard conditions, and mitigation. As such, all applicable design features, standard conditions, and mitigation measures are listed within their respective topical environmental impacts discussion. Therefore, the following discussion focuses on the ability of the alternatives to further reduce Project impacts and the potential impacts of the Project alternatives related to these issues.

5.2 ALTERNATIVES INITIALLY CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Section 15126.6(c) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires EIRs to identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected during the scoping process and

briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. In evaluating an appropriate range of alternatives to the proposed Project, a number of alternatives were considered and rejected for differing reasons by the City.

The alternatives considered and rejected for the proposed Project are described below.

5.2.1 Fully Enclosed Pools Alternative

The Fully Enclosed Pools Alternative assumes that all of the proposed pools would be enclosed by the Bubble structure. This alternative was considered because it would provide all visitors a controlled-climate swimming experience while simultaneously containing noise generated during aquatic activities in an attempt to reduce the potential for noise impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods.

A complex design that is able to enclose all the proposed pools was found to require a building footprint that encompasses a majority of the southern boundary of the Project site potentially blocking more scenic views than the former Belmont Pool. When considering the design of the structure required to enclose all the pools, the proposed Bubble structure of this alternative had the potential to substantially exceed the height, mass, and scale of the former Belmont pool complex. Although this alternative would replace the former Belmont Pool with a new pool facility, it was anticipated that the design of the building required to enclose all pools would substantially degrade the character of the site and have a substantially adverse effect on the scenic views of the coastline resulting in significant aesthetics impacts.

This alternative would include all operational characteristics and activities required to meet the recreational objectives for the Project. However, as described above, the scale and mass of the Bubble structure would likely lead to a significant aesthetic impacts, in conflict with the objective of minimizing view disruptions compared to the previous facility. Therefore, the Fully Enclosed Pools Alternative would not achieve the neighborhood compatibility desired by the objectives for the proposed Project. In addition, the increased structure size would require a longer construction period, additional construction materials, and increased demand for heating and cooling, thereby increasing potential air quality and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. Therefore, it was concluded that due to the potential increased GHG impacts, along with aesthetic impacts in conflict with the objectives for minimizing view disruptions, the Fully Enclosed Pools Alternative was rejected.

5.2.2 Alternative Project Locations

CEQA requires that the discussions of alternatives focus on alternatives to the Project or its location that is capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant impacts of the Project. The key question and first step in the decision whether to include in the Draft EIR an analysis of alternative sites is whether any of the significant impacts of the Project would be avoided or substantially lessened by relocating the Project. Only developments or locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the Project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(f)(2)(A)). Further, *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(f)(1) states that alternative locations only

need be considered if the Project proponent can reasonably acquire or already owns the identified alternative site. If it is determined that no feasible alternative locations exist, the EIR must disclose the reasons for this conclusion (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(f)(2)(B)).

Three alternative locations for the proposed Project were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR. A discussion of each alternative site is included below.

Harry Bridges Memorial Park. The Harry Bridges Memorial Park is a 4.1-acre park located within the Tidelands on the Pier J waterfront at Queens Highway and Harbor Scenic Drive in the City of Long Beach. The site consists of turf, trees, and small facilities for outside events. The site was considered because it does not contain major structures and because of its location near existing public use areas such as the Queen Mary, the Long Beach Arena, and the Aquarium of the Pacific. However, the Harry Bridges Memorial Park was designated as part of the parkland mitigation for the development of the Aquarium of the Pacific and Rainbow Harbor to replace recreational open space in Shoreline Park funded under the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act. Under Section 6(f)(3) of the LWCF Act, the Harry Bridges Memorial Park may not be converted to uses other than public outdoor recreation uses. For this protection to include the proposed Project's enclosed areas as an allowable use, a required petition to the Secretary of the Interior would be required. The petition process with the Secretary of the Interior was considered prohibitive due to the extended time, cost, and uncertain outcome. Additionally, the Harry Bridges Memorial Park is 1.7 acres smaller than the proposed Project site and is not likely to be able to accommodate the required infrastructure for the proposed Project or be able to maintain or increase the amount of open space compared to the former Belmont pool facility (Objective 15). A smaller aquatic facility would also not meet the objectives related to provision of a facility that supports all competitive swimming events, and increased programmable space to minimize scheduling conflicts (Objectives 2, 4, 5, and 7). Currently, the site is used for special events booked through the Queen Mary and there is no public parking at the site. The lack of adequate dedicated parking would negatively impact the future use of the site for the pool facilities.

Due to the location, this site would not allow for summer aquatics camps to have access to the beach, sailing center, or pier facilities, activities, which occurred at the former facility and are planned to continue at the new facility. This alternative site would not be directly accessible for pedestrian and/or bicycle users, and would therefore not serve these existing users (Objective 13).

In addition, this site would not meet many of the other project objectives including: redevelopment of the City-owned site of the former Belmont Pool facility (Objective 1); Minimization of the time period that the community is without a permanent recreation and competitive pool facility (Objective 3); Implementation of the land use goals of Planned Development PD-2 (regulations specific to the Belmont Pool and Pier) at the former site (Objective 9); and provision of views to the ocean from inside the facility (Objective 12). Therefore, for the reasons stated above, the Harry Bridges Memorial Park was rejected as a potential alternative site and was not considered further.

Queen Mary Site. The Queen Mary Site encompasses 43-acres of land located on the Pier J waterfront at the terminus of Queens Highway in the City of Long Beach. The site features the 1936 Queen Mary ocean liner, which is permanently moored and operates as a hotel and event center. The site also includes the Queen Mary Events Park, Sea Walk Village, adjacent Carnival Cruise Lines terminal, and associated parking areas. This alternative site was considered because of its location near existing public use areas such as the Long Beach Arena and the Aquarium of the Pacific. However, the site is currently leased to a private operator and not under the City's control. The current lease expires in approximately 40 years, and therefore the site would not be available for the City's use without renegotiating the lease and paying for the use of the site. The length of the existing lease makes the site unavailable for years, which is in conflict with Objective 3, to minimize the time the public is without a permanent pool facility. Furthermore, the site already provides parking for the current uses (Queen Mary ocean liner, Queen Mary Events Park, Sea Walk Village, and the Carnival Cruise Lines terminal), and would require the need for additional parking for the proposed Project. Providing additional parking for this site would be a challenge due to the current uses already competing for adequate parking spaces.

In addition, the site location would not allow for summer aquatics camps to have access to beach, sailing center, or pier facilities at this site, activities which occurred at the former facility and are planned to continue at the new facility. Traffic volumes associated with Interstate-710 (I-710) and the Magnolia Avenue/Queensway Bay Bridge are greater than the street system surrounding the proposed Project site. As a result, impacts related to traffic, parking, and air quality impacts would be greater than the proposed Project. This would result in recreational uses and sensitive receptors (swimmers, spectators) being located closer to pollution sources, such as the Port of Long Beach and truck traffic in the vicinity of the port. Finally, the Queen Mary Site would not redevelop the City-owned site of the former Belmont Pool facility (Objective 1).

In addition to not meeting Objectives 1 and 3, this site would not meet the other project objectives including: implementation of the land use goals of Planned Development PD-2 (regulations specific to the Belmont Pool and Pier) at the former site (Objective 9); provision of views to the ocean from inside the facility (Objective 12); and would not be directly accessible for pedestrian and/or bicycle users, therefore not serve these existing users (Objective 13). For the reasons stated above, the Queen Mary site was rejected as a potential alternative site and was not considered further.

“Elephant Lot” at the Long Beach Convention Center. The “Elephant Lot” is an approximately 13-acre surface parking lot on the east side of the Long Beach Convention Center (LBCC). The site is bound by East Seaside Way to the north, East Shoreline Drive to the south and east, and convention center facilities to the west. The site was considered because of its location in the Downtown area and proximity to existing public use areas, such as the LBCC, the Long Beach Arena and the Aquarium of the Pacific. However, Jehovah's Witness currently leases this parking lot site to accommodate parking demands during the annual convention at the LBCC. The lease expires in 2030 and requires 3,000 parking spaces

in two different lots, currently the “Elephant Lot” provides over half of these parking spaces (1,915 spaces). Due to the existing lease, this alternative site is in conflict with Objective 3, to minimize the time the public is without a permanent pool facility. Further, any loss of parking for Jehovah’s Witness or the LBCC would require additional mitigation. Special events, such as the annual Grand Prix of Long Beach, also use the parking lot for events and staging. This alternative site would not represent the highest and best land use for the area adjacent to the convention center, which should be reserved for convention or hotel uses.

Although the proposed pool facility would be compatible with the scale and character of the Downtown area, the unique architecture of the proposed facility would compete with the LBCC and aquarium buildings, and, therefore, the proposed facility would no longer stand out as a signature design as it would at the proposed Project site (Objective 6).

In addition to not meeting Objectives 3 and 6, this site would not meet the other project objectives including: implementation of the land use goals of Planned Development PD-2 (regulations specific to the Belmont Pool and Pier) at the former site (Objective 9); provision of views to the ocean from inside the facility (Objective 12); and would not be directly accessible for pedestrian and/or bicycle users, therefore not serve these existing users (Objective 13). In addition, this implementation of the proposed Project on this alternative site would require a Local Coastal Program amendment, which would not be required at the Project site. For the reasons stated above, the “Elephant Lot” site was rejected as a potential alternative site and was not considered further.

Conclusion. For the reasons detailed above, none of the three alternative sites were deemed feasible and are therefore not analyzed further in the Draft EIR. The proposed Project involves replacement of the former Belmont Pool complex on the subject property, which has a notable aquatic history associated with the location. In November 1961, the Long Beach City Council voted to place an item on the February 1962 municipal election for the use of Tidelands funds for the construction of the “Belmont Plaza Beach Center” (now Belmont Plaza) project, which included a swimming pool, wading pool, and public parking lot. Proposition 7 was approved by the voters in February 1962, and the City Council ratified the election results in March 1962, paving the way for site acquisition and eventual construction.

In January 1967, plans were approved for a group of structures at Belmont Plaza, a site west of the Belmont Pier on the beach in Belmont Shore. The Belmont Pool opened in 1968 in time for the United States (U.S.) Olympic swimming trials. The facility hosted both the 1968 and the 1976 U.S. Olympic swimming trials, as well as the 1974 and 1978 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) swimming championships. Mark Spitz, Don Schollander, and Charles Hickox set men’s records during these trials. After the trials, the pool was opened to the public for recreational purposes.

The designated property consists of both “Open Space and Parks” and “Mixed Uses” land use designations and is within the Park (P) and Belmont Pier Planned Development District (PD-2, Subarea 1) zoning areas, which allows for the previous and proposed recreational uses. Moreover, all impacts of the proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Relocating the Project to an alternative location would not avoid or reduce any of

the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project. Because the former Belmont Pool complex has been in operation on the Project site for the last 47 years, placing the facilities on another site would not meet several of the project objectives, as outlined above.

Additionally, funding for the proposed Project is entirely sourced from the Tidelands Operating Fund, an umbrella fund that allocates expenditures for tidelands operations and capital improvements projects within the tidelands area of the City. Tidelands are defined as those lands and water areas along the coast of the Pacific Ocean seaward of the ordinary high tide line to a distance of 3 miles. The Tidelands Trust not only restricts the use of the tidelands, but also restricts the use of income and revenue generated from businesses and activities conducted on the tidelands to be used solely for projects within the tidelands area. Because the proposed Project is dependent on funding from the Tidelands Operating Fund, any alternative location not in the tidelands would have to be funded through alternative sources. Due to a lack of available finances from other City sources, a project that would not be funded by the Tidelands Operating Fund would not be economically infeasible. Therefore, all three alternative sites were located in the tidelands. Additionally, according to the City, no other properties within the City's Tidelands would be large enough or are currently available to be considered as an alternative location. Therefore, the EIR does not include analysis regarding alternative locations.

5.3 ALTERNATIVES UNDER CONSIDERATION

Section 21100 of the Public Resources Code (PRC) and Section 15126.6 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* require an EIR to identify and discuss a No Project Alternative as well as a reasonable range of alternatives to a project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts. Based on the criteria listed above, the No Project Alternative and four project Alternatives have been selected to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the proposed Project. These alternatives include revisions to the proposed Project plans and reduced scale projects. The alternatives considered in this EIR include the following:

- **Alternative 1: No Project/No New Development.** This alternative would involve no changes to the existing land uses and conditions on the Project site. No new development on the Project site would occur. The temporary pool located in the parking area would continue to operate but no new pool facilities or open space would be constructed. The existing backfilled sand area where the previous building was located would remain unchanged.
- **Alternative 2: Maintain Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses.** This alternative would involve improvements to construct a permanent foundation and permanent administrative and support facilities (lockers, restrooms, snack bar) consistent with the temporary pool configuration. The existing backfilled sand area would be removed and the open space park area would be expanded.
- **Alternative 3: Outdoor Diving Well.** This alternative would be similar to the proposed Project, but would locate the diving well outside the proposed enclosed pool facility. This alternative would require a revised site plan and would allow the building height to be

- reduced. All other components would be included in this alternative, allowing similar programming and events to occur at the site.
- **Alternative 4: Reduced Project - No Outdoor Components.** This alternative would eliminate the outdoor pool component and reduce the overall footprint of the pool structure. Open space and park areas would be increased under this alternative. Many of the facility amenities would remain, and the indoor pool components, would remain the same as the proposed Project. A height variance would still be required under this alternative because the diving well would still be located within the structure.
 - **Alternative 5: Reduced Project - No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components.** This alternative would be similar to Alternative 4, but would eliminate the indoor diving well component along with the outdoor pool facilities. This alternative would reduce the overall footprint and height of the pool structure, increasing open space and park areas. Although the diving well would not be included, a height variance would still be required under this alternative because the existing height limitation is 30’.

For each alternative, the analysis provides the following:

- Description of each alternative;
- Environmental analysis of the potential impacts of the alternative and the significance of those impacts (per the *State CEQA Guidelines*, significant effects of an alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than those of the proposed Project);
- Overview of the potential impacts of the alternative and the significance of those impacts; and
- Summary comparison of the alternative relative to the proposed Project’s impacts, specifically addressing whether the alternative would meet the Project objectives, eliminate or reduce impacts as compared to the Project, and other comparative merits.

Table 5.A follows with a summary of each of the development alternatives.

5.4 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT/NO NEW DEVELOPMENT

5.4.1 Description

Consistent with Section 15126.6(e) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the No Project/No Development Alternative is the existing condition of the Project site at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved. The setting of the site at the time the NOP was issued (April, 2014) is described throughout Section 4.0 of this EIR with respect to individual environmental issues and the baseline of the impact assessment of the proposed Project. At the time of the NOP, the Project site contained both the Belmont Pool facilities and the outdoor temporary pool (constructed in the Beach Parking Lot and opened in December 2013 in order to provide swimming facilities while the permanent facility is under construction). Although the site contained the former Belmont Pool building at the time the NOP was issued, the facility was subsequently demolished in February 2015 to alleviate an imminent public safety threat due to the seismically unsafe condition of the building.

Table 5.A: Summary of Development Alternatives

Alternative	Description	Basis for Selection and Summary Analysis
Proposed Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 5.8 ac. • Consistent with “Open Space and Parks” and “Mixed Uses” General Plan Land Use designations, and Park (P) and Belmont Pier Planned Development District (PD-2, Subarea 1) zoning designations. • Total new construction includes: 125,500 sf of new building space, 18,610 sf indoor pool surface area, 17,840 sf outdoor pool surface area, 55,745 sf passive park/landscaping 127,085 sf open space 1,250 permanent indoor seats, 3,000 temporary outdoor seats • Height variance required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Project is consistent with land use and zoning designations. • Meets all of the Project objectives. • Refer to Chapters 3.0 and 4.0 of this Draft EIR.
Alternative 1: No Project/No New Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 5.8 ac. • Project site would retain land use and zoning designations. • Two outdoor pools (4,400 sf) and temporary pool (13,450 sf) would remain. • Former Belmont Pool building location would be vacant. • Passive park and on-site landscaping would remain. • No height variance required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The No Project Alternative is required by CEQA. • Inconsistent with the majority of Project objectives.
Alternative 2: Maintain Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 5.8 ac. • Two outdoor pools (4,400 sf) and temporary pool (13,450 sf) would remain. • Temporary pool foundation would be constructed. • Permanent administrative and support facilities (lockers, restrooms, snack bar) would be constructed. • The existing backfilled sand area would be removed and passive park and on-site landscaping would be expanded. • Consistent with land use and zoning designations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhances views since former pool facility would not be reconstructed. • Converts existing temporary pool to a permanent facility. • Retains 2 existing outdoor pools. • Adds supporting ancillary uses. • Increases amount of open space. • Substantial reduction in usable pool space compared to proposed Project. • Unable to provide adequate programmable space. • Meets some of the Project objectives; but is inconsistent with most objectives.
Alternative 3: Outdoor Diving Well Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 5.8 ac. • Consistent with “Open Space and Parks” and “Mixed Uses” General Plan Land Use designations, and Park (P) and Belmont Pier Planned Development District (PD-2, Subarea 1) zoning designations. • Building height would be reduced, but would still require a height variance. • Total new construction would be similar to the proposed project; increasing outdoor pool area while slightly reducing indoor pool area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces the height of the Bubble structure; height variance still required. • Land use and zoning designations are compatible with proposed uses. • Increased outdoor activity could result in increased noise impacts compared to the proposed Project. • Meets most of the Project objectives, but to a lesser degree than the proposed Project.

Table 5.A: Summary of Development Alternatives

Alternative	Description	Basis for Selection and Summary Analysis
Alternative 4: Reduced Project - No Outdoor Components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 5.8 ac. • Consistent with “Open Space and Parks” and “Mixed Uses” General Plan Land Use designations, and Park (P) and Belmont Pier Planned Development District (PD-2, Subarea 1) zoning designations. • No reduction in the height of the building structure; height variance required. • Total new construction includes approximately 100,000 sf of new building space, 25,500 sf less than Proposed Project. • 18,610 sf indoor pool surface area. • 1,250 permanent indoor seating. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equal or fewer physical environmental impacts as compared to the proposed Project due to the removal of the outdoor pool and reduction in square footage of proposed Project. • Land use and zoning designations are compatible with proposed uses. • Decreased noise impacts through elimination of outdoor pool component. • Substantial reduction in usable pool space compared to proposed Project. • Meets some of the Project objectives, but to a lesser degree than the proposed Project.
Alternative 5: Reduced Project - No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 5.8 ac. • Consistent with “Open Space and Parks” and “Mixed Uses” General Plan Land Use designations, and Park (P) and Belmont Pier Planned Development District (PD-2, Subarea 1) zoning designations. • Building height would be reduced, but would still require a height variance. • Total new construction includes approximately 100,000 sf of new building space, 25,500 sf less than Proposed Project. • 14,290 sf indoor pool surface area. • 1,250 permanent indoor seating. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equal or fewer physical environmental impacts as compared to the proposed Project due to the removal of the outdoor pool and reduction in square footage of proposed Project. • Reduces the height of the building; height variance still required. • Decreased noise impacts through elimination of outdoor pool component. • Land use and zoning designations are compatible with proposed uses. • Substantial reduction in usable pool space compared to proposed Project. • Meets some of the Project objectives, but to a lesser degree than the proposed Project.

Source: LSA Associates, Inc. (March 2016).
ac = acre(s)
CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
EIR = Environmental Impact Report
sf = square feet

Therefore, the No Project Alternative will evaluate circumstances under which the Belmont Pool would no longer be present on site and includes the environmental condition for which no structures are rebuilt but where the temporary pool remains on the site until it reaches the end of its useful life.

5.4.2 Environmental Analysis

The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that the on-site conditions, including the backfilled sand area where the former building stood, the existing open space areas, and

the temporary pool would remain unchanged except for the reasonably foreseeable pool and park maintenance activities. All required permits and standard conditions related to demolition were addressed in the emergency permit processed as a separate project. As this alternative would not include the construction or operation of a new pool facility, it would eliminate all construction activities and any increase in operations, resulting in reduced environmental impacts when compared to the proposed Project.

Existing views of and from the site and the visual character of the area would not be altered. No new air pollutant emissions or greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions would be generated by new visitors, and no short-term construction emissions would occur since no new construction is proposed. The existing vegetation and wildlife on site would not be disturbed compared with existing conditions. Unknown potential subsurface archaeological and paleontological resources would remain undisturbed. There would be no impacts related to geology, soils, or hazardous materials. No short-term construction noise impacts or new long-term operational noise impacts would occur to the surrounding area. The No Project/No Development Alternative would enhance views in comparison to the proposed Project because the site where the former Belmont Pool facility stood would remain vacant and no new structures would be constructed. No additional requirements for fire or police services would occur. No additional vehicle trips would be generated by the site, no new sources of solid waste would be created by this alternative, and no increase in demand for energy would occur as a result of development.

However, under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the temporary pool would remain in place and would continue to degrade until it reaches the end of its operational lifespan, increasing the maintenance costs associated with operation of the facilities. There would be no change to the proposed Project site with regard to the percentage of the site that would remain pervious or the volume of runoff during a storm event, and runoff treatment from best management practices (BMPs) that are included in the proposed Project would not be implemented, resulting in incrementally greater hydrology/water quality impacts as compared to the proposed Project. In addition, the land use goals of the PD-2 designation (regulations specific to the use of the site for the Belmont Pool and Pier) would not be implemented and therefore the No Project/No Development Alternative would be in conflict with the City's land use plans for the site and have greater land use impacts as compared to the proposed project. The foreseeable impacts of the No Project/No Development Alternative include the permanent loss of parking where the temporary pool is located, and the inadequacy of the temporary facilities to replace the former aquatic facilities and serve the community/public recreational needs. Therefore, the No Project alternative would have greater impacts to Recreation than the proposed project.

5.4.3 Attainment of Project Objectives

The No Project/No Development Alternative would only achieve two of the Project objectives; this alternative would minimize view disruptions and maintain the amount of open space compared to the former Belmont Pool facility because no new structures would be constructed on the site (Project Objectives 11 and 15). The temporary pool would remain on a site that serves the existing users, but to a much lesser extent than the proposed Project's ability to accommodate the community/public needs (Project Objective 13).

The previous aquatic facility would not be replaced/redeveloped with a more modern facility including a 4,250 spectator capacity that better meets the needs of the aquatics community (Project Objectives 1, 2, and 4). The No Project/No Development Alternative would not increase programmable water space to relieve overcrowding and accommodate swim, diving, and water polo national/ international events in a new pool complex that is distinctive in design, yet is compatible with the seaside neighborhood (Project Objectives 5, 6, and 7). Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the City would not be able to operate a pool facility that would generate revenue to help offset the ongoing operation and maintenance costs (Objective 8). Because the No Project/No Development Alternative would not include the construction of a new pool facility or associated improvements, this alternative would not achieve the design oriented objectives of the proposed Project (Objectives 9, 10, 12, and 14). Additionally, because no development would occur under this alternative, the time that the community is without a state of the art recreation and competitive pool would be extended indefinitely and not minimized (Project Objective 3).

5.4.4 Conclusion

The No Project/No Development Alternative acknowledges the demolition of the previous seismically unsafe pool structure under an emergency permit as a separate project. Because this alternative would not provide the new outdoor pool components associated with the proposed Project, it would reduce potentially significant noise impacts. However, a majority of the Project objectives would not be achieved with the No Project/No Development Alternative, and none of the Project benefits would be realized.

5.5 ALTERNATIVE 2: MAINTAIN TEMPORARY POOL WITH ANCILLARY USES

5.5.1 Description

This alternative would include the conversion of the temporary pool (approximately 13,450 sf) into a permanent aquatic facility, and would retain the existing two outdoor pools (4,400 sf). Alternative 2 would include the construction of a permanent foundation for the pool along with construction of new administrative and support facilities (lockers, restrooms, snack bar). The site plan for this alternative would be consistent with the temporary pool configuration, with administrative and support facilities placed adjacent to the pool. The existing backfilled sand area would be removed and the park area would be expanded.

5.5.2 Environmental Analysis

Aesthetics. Alternative 2 would maintain the existing site configuration of the temporary pool, but would include the installation of a permanent foundation for the pool and associated facilities. The proposed Bubble structure would not be included in the design of Alternative 2. The absence of the Bubble structure would represent a substantial reduction in the overall footprint of the pool facility as compared to the proposed Project. This alternative would be substantially smaller in scale, and on- and off-site views of the Project site would be enhanced from the existing conditions because no new structures would be constructed on the

vacant former Belmont Pool site. Open space and park area would be substantially increased under this alternative because the existing backfilled sand area would be removed and the park area would be expanded. This alternative would, like the proposed Project, be required to comply with the City's lighting code. Under this alternative, potential aesthetic impacts related to construction would be reduced compared to impacts under the proposed Project because construction activities would be reduced. Similar to the proposed Project, visual impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be considered less than significant. However, Alternative 2 would result in fewer aesthetics-related construction and operational impacts as compared to the proposed Project because the administrative facilities would be housed in a significantly smaller building

Air Quality. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to air quality. Construction and operational emissions associated with Alternative 2 would be reduced since the amount of operational pool space would be reduced and fewer vehicle trips would be generated due to the reduced size of the alternative. Overall, air quality impacts would be incrementally reduced during construction when compared to the Project due to the substantial reduction in permanent structures that would be constructed on the Project site. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would not exceed significance thresholds for criteria pollutants with implementation of mitigation and standard South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) measures. Operational impacts would be reduced due to the reduced amount of pool square footage. Overall, there would be fewer air quality emissions; therefore, Alternative 2 would result in fewer air quality impacts than the proposed Project.

Biological Resources. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to biological resources. Unlike the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would not include the removal of existing vegetation on the Project site to create the open space and park areas. Rather, the existing backfilled sand area would be removed and the park area would be expanded without the need for tree removal. Therefore, unlike the proposed Project, implementation of Alternative 2 would not require mitigation to reduce potential impacts associated with the removal of on-site ornamental landscaping and associated nesting bird species during the breeding season. This alternative would implement a landscape plan similar to the proposed Project but with more open space. Overall, biological impacts associated with Alternative 2 are considered to be less than those identified for the proposed Project.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would not significantly impact known cultural resources. No archaeological or historical resources are known to exist at the Project site. However, a sensitive geologic formation, Young Alluvial Floodplain Deposits, have the potential to be encountered at approximately 23 feet (ft) below grade. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would involve some excavation and construction activities and would be required to adhere to mitigation to protect any unknown archaeological or paleontological resources. Therefore, this alternative's impacts to cultural resources would be similar to the proposed Project.

Geology and Soils. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils with implementation of mitigation and adherence to the recommendations of the geology study and additional testing for corrosive soils. Construction and excavation activities associated with implementation of this alternative would be reduced as compared to those associated with the proposed Project; therefore, impacts to geology and soils would be fewer but similar. Geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative 2 are, therefore, considered to be similar to the proposed Project.

Global Climate Change. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to GHG emissions and global climate change. Overall, GHG emissions would be incrementally reduced during construction when compared to the proposed Project due to the reduced amount of building construction. Operational emissions would also be reduced with the reduced amount of square footage and fewer vehicle trips. Overall, there would be fewer GHG emissions; therefore, Alternative 2 would have fewer GHG impacts as compared to the proposed Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. Although there would be reduced construction required for this alternative, Alternative 2 would still be required to implement mitigation measures to reduce impacts associated with regulations for handling hazardous materials during construction activities. Neither the proposed Project nor Alternative 2 would result in significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials during Project operations. Overall, impacts related to hazardous materials are considered the same for Alternative 2 as for the proposed Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Similar to the proposed Project, construction of Alternative 2 could potentially impact water quality related to erosion and pollutants. However, compliance with regulatory requirements and mitigation would ensure these impacts would be less than significant. Water quality impacts associated with construction would be similar, although reduced for this alternative, because the ancillary structures to be constructed would be significantly reduced as compared to the proposed Project. Additionally, Alternative 2 would not include the Bubble structure and, therefore, would have a substantially reduced building square footage and amount of impervious surfaces, resulting in less runoff than the proposed Project. With compliance with regulatory requirements, operational impacts would be less than significant for this alternative, similar to the proposed Project. Overall, impacts related to hydrology for Alternative 2 would be less than for the proposed Project.

Land Use. Unlike the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would not include the construction of the Bubble structure or any other buildings to house pool facilities, and, therefore, a variance for the exceedance of the 30-foot height limit would not be required. Under this alternative, as well as the proposed Project, there would be no impacts related to the division of an

existing community. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would be consistent with the policies contained in the City's General Plan and the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan. Overall, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would not conflict with adjacent land uses and would be consistent with applicable goals and policies from the City's General Plan, and the City's Zoning Code. However, unlike the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would include the permanent loss of approximately 135 parking spaces where the temporary pool would be made permanent in the western part of the Beach Parking Lot. This permanent loss of parking would have the potential to violate the provisions of the California Coastal Act of 1976 and the Local Coastal Program if it is interpreted that this parking loss would decrease public access to the coast. Therefore, impacts related to land use for Alternative 2 are considered incrementally greater than the proposed Project.

Noise. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to noise. However, Alternative 2 would reduce the duration of the construction activities and would, therefore, result in reduced construction-related noise impacts.

Alternative 2 would convert the temporary pool to a permanent facility, with seating and outdoor speakers. Crowd noise and whistles from aquatic events would occur, similar to existing conditions, under this alternative. This alternative would not include any indoor facilities, and the noise generated from outdoor aquatic events would be similar to the existing temporary pool and the outdoor facilities under the proposed Project. Neither the proposed Project nor Alternative 2 would result in significant adverse impacts related to noise during construction or Project operations. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in similar operational noise impacts as compared to the proposed Project.

Recreation. Under both the proposed Project and Alternative 2, access to the Belmont Veteran's Memorial Pier, parking lots, beach areas, and the pedestrian/bicycle path may be subject to disruption during construction activities. However, both alternatives would include implementation of mitigation requiring a Construction Traffic Management Plan. Therefore, construction activities are expected to have less than significant impacts on access to the surrounding off-site recreational facilities for both the proposed Project and this alternative.

Alternative 2, similar to the proposed Project, would not result in an increased demand for recreational facilities but could require development or expansion of additional recreational facilities in order to meet the needs of the competitive swimming, diving, and water polo communities. Neither this alternative nor the proposed Project changes the Project site's intended and designated use for recreational purposes. Although no significant and unavoidable recreational impacts are identified for either scenario, Alternative 2 would include a total pool surface area of 17,850 sf, 560 sf less than the surface water area of the former Belmont Pool facility. Without any increase in the pool surface area from the former Belmont pool, recreational and competitive activities could not occur simultaneously, and the demand for programming competitive swimmers, divers, and aquatic sports participants would not be met. Therefore, operational recreational impacts are considered greater than the proposed project for this alternative.

Transportation and Circulation. Under both the proposed Project and Alternative 2, potentially significant impacts related to construction traffic and special event traffic could occur. However, both alternatives would include implementation of mitigation requiring an Event Traffic Management Plan for special events, and a Construction Traffic Management Plan. Implementation of these traffic plans would ensure that less than significant traffic impacts would occur for both the proposed Project and Alternative 2.

Construction and operational traffic associated with Alternative 2 would be reduced since the amount of operational pool space and temporary spectator seating would also be reduced resulting in fewer vehicle trips generated. Although no significant and unavoidable traffic impacts are identified for either scenario, because Alternative 2 reduces the amount of construction required and significantly reduces the proposed pool surface area and programming opportunities, traffic impacts are considered to be less for this alternative when compared to the proposed Project. Overall, traffic impacts would be reduced during construction and operations when compared to the Project; therefore, Alternative 2 would have fewer traffic impacts than the proposed Project.

Utilities and Service Systems. Alternative 2 eliminates the indoor pools and diving well, thereby decreasing the usable pool space by approximately 49 percent. Demand for water, electricity, and natural gas would be reduced as there would be less pool area to maintain and heat. The reduced pool space would lead to a reduction in visitors and the number of special events, and subsequently, a reduction in the amount of demand for most utilities and service systems. The capacity needs for wastewater, solid waste, and, as a result of a decrease in impervious area, urban runoff would be reduced as well. Under Alternative 2, emergency calls for police and fire services are anticipated to be the same or less than for the proposed Project. Although no significant and unavoidable utilities and service systems impacts are identified for either scenario, because Alternative 2 reduces the total amount of pool space by approximately 49 percent, Alternative 2 would have fewer utilities and service system impacts than the proposed Project.

5.5.3 Attainment of Project Objectives

Unlike the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would not replace the former Belmont Pool complex with a modern pool complex. This alternative would convert the existing temporary pool facilities into permanent structures and would include the construction of associated support facilities. Alternative 2 would achieve some, but not all, of the Project objectives.

The administrative and support facilities would occupy a substantially reduced project footprint as compared to the proposed Project, and, therefore, minimize view disruptions compared to the proposed Project and would maximize views to the ocean from the newly-permanent outdoor facility (Objectives 11 and 12). Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would maintain the pool facility in a location that would serve the existing users, although not to the same extent as the proposed Project, and would provide a passive open space area (Objectives 13 and 14). The existing backfilled sand area would be removed

and the park area would be expanded under Alternative 2, therefore increasing the amount of open space compared to the former Belmont Pool facility (Objective 15).

Similar to the proposed Project, the outdoor facility would utilize high performance materials for the maximization of sustainability and energy efficiency as determined feasible (Objective 10).

The activities to make the existing pool facilities permanent would reduce the amount and length of construction required to build the Project, which would minimize the time period that the community is without a pool facility (Objective 3). However, Alternative 2 would not provide a new pool complex, and, therefore, would not achieve any of the project objectives associated with the implementation of a new pool facility on the former Belmont Pool site (Objectives 1, 2, and 6). Although the outdoor temporary pool is 50 meters x 25 meters, it would not be able to meet the full demand for recreation and competition pool use, would not have any permanent seating, and could not host events to the same degree as the proposed Project (Objective 4). Although would be able to operate a pool facility, Alternative 2 would not increase programmable water space, accommodate national/international aquatic events, or generate revenue from pool facility events to the same extent as the proposed Project (Objectives 5, 7, and 8). Therefore, Alternative 2 would not meet the needs of the aquatic community.

Although this alternative would not require a height variance for the Bubble structure, Alternative 2 would include additional impacts related to parking losses. Unlike the proposed Project, Alternatives 2 includes the permanent loss of approximately 135 parking spaces in the western part of the Beach Parking Lot, the existing location of the temporary pool. This permanent loss of parking would require replacement parking elsewhere in the vicinity of the pool facility, which would be determined according to the provisions of PD-2 and the Local Coastal Program if it is interpreted that this parking loss would decrease public access to the coast. Alternative 2 would include the potential for additional impacts related to compliance with the land use provisions of PD-2 (Objective 9).

Therefore, the elimination of indoor pools and to the conversion of the temporary pool to a permanent facility under Alternative 2 would not maximize the potential of the site as an aquatic recreational complex. Although Alternative 2 would meet Project Objectives 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, it would not meet them to the same degree as the proposed Project. In addition, this alternative would not meet any of the Project Objectives related to the provision of a new pool complex that would serve the recreation needs of the general public, as well as the needs of the established aquatic community served by the former Belmont Pool facility.

5.5.4 Conclusion

Alternative 2 would eliminate the indoor pool facility and reduce the total pool surface area by approximately 49 percent. The reduced project footprint would result in an increase in open space. Although the indoor pool component would be eliminated with Alternative 2, impacts related to cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, and noise (operations) would be similar to the proposed Project for this alternative.

Construction-related biological resources, hydrology and water quality, air quality, global climate change, noise, and traffic impacts would be fewer than those under the proposed Project because construction activities would be reduced.

Operational-related impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, global climate change, hydrology and water quality, noise, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project. These impacts were determined to be less than significant for the proposed Project, and would remain less than significant for this alternative.

Compared to the proposed Project, land use and recreational impacts are greater for Alternative 2 due to the permanent loss of public beach parking and the reduction in available recreational opportunities and programmable water area as compared to the proposed Project. A variance could be required if the replacement parking cannot be relocated as provided in the land use requirements outlined in PD-2.

Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts. However, due to the elimination of the indoor pool component under Alternative 2, overall impacts would be incrementally less than the proposed Project with the exception of land use and recreational impacts, which would be greater.

5.6 ALTERNATIVE 3: OUTDOOR DIVING WELL/REVISED SITE PLAN

5.6.1 Description

This alternative would be similar to the proposed Project, but would locate the diving well outside the proposed pool facility. Locating the diving well outside the Bubble structure would reduce the height of the building. However, a height variance would still be required as the building would exceed the 30' height limit. Due to space constraints in the proposed outdoor aquatic area, the separate 115 sf whirlpool for divers would not be included in Alternative 3.

5.6.2 Environmental Analysis

Aesthetics. Alternative 3 would modify the aesthetics of the proposed structure. The location of the diving well outside of the Bubble structure would decrease the height of the building, thereby representing a reduction in the overall scale of the structure as compared to the proposed Project. Although this alternative would be smaller in scale, on- and off-site views of the Project site would be similar to the proposed Project because the Bubble, the Support Bar Building, the Beach Café, and a majority of the Plinth would still be constructed. The open space and park area would increase under this alternative. The location of the diving well to the outdoor areas would require additional, taller outdoor lighting fixtures, but similar to the proposed Project, this alternative would be required to comply with the City's lighting code. Potential aesthetic impacts related to construction would be reduced, but similar compared to impacts under the proposed Project. Similar to the proposed Project, visual impacts associated with Alternative 3 would be considered less than significant. However,

because the building height would be reduced, Alternative 3 would result in reduced visual impacts as compared to the proposed Project.

Air Quality. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to air quality. Construction and operational emissions associated with Alternative 3 would be similar since the site plan would be revised but similar vehicle trips would be generated. Although the bubble structure would be reduced in height, Overall air quality impacts would be similar during construction when compared to the Project due to the similar structures proposed for construction. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not exceed significance thresholds for criteria pollutants with implementation of mitigation and standard South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) measures. Operational impacts would be similar with minor changes to the amount of pool square footage. Overall, there would be similar air quality emissions; therefore, Alternative 3 would result in air quality impacts similar to the proposed Project.

Biological Resources. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to biological resources. Alternative 3, like the proposed Project, would remove vegetation on the Project site to create the open space and park areas. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, implementation of Alternative 3 would include mitigation to reduce potential impacts associated with the removal of on-site ornamental landscaping and associated nesting bird species during the breeding season. This alternative would implement a landscape plan similar to the proposed Project. Therefore, biological impacts associated with Alternative 3 are considered to be similar to the proposed Project.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not significantly impact known cultural resources. No archaeological or historical resources are known to exist at the Project site. However, a sensitive geologic formation, Young Alluvial Floodplain Deposits, have the potential to be encountered at approximately 23 ft below grade. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would involve excavation and construction activities and would be required to adhere to mitigation to protect any unknown archaeological or paleontological resources. Therefore, this alternative's impacts to cultural resources would be similar to the proposed Project.

Geology and Soils. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils with implementation of mitigation and adherence to the recommendations of the geology study and additional testing for corrosive soils. Construction and excavation activities associated with implementation of this alternative would be similar to those associated with the proposed Project; therefore, impacts to geology and soils would be comparable. Geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative 3 are, therefore, considered to be similar to the proposed Project.

Global Climate Change. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to GHG emissions and global climate change. Overall, GHG emissions would be similar during construction when compared to the proposed Project due to the comparable amount of building construction. Operational emissions for Alternative 3 would also be similar to the proposed Project due to a similar amount of square footage and similar projected uses at the facility. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have similar GHG impacts as the proposed Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. Although there would be revisions to the site plan for this alternative, Alternative 3 would still be required to implement mitigation measures to reduce impacts associated with regulations for handling hazardous materials during construction activities. Neither the proposed Project nor Alternative 3 would result in significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials during Project operations. Overall, impacts related to hazardous materials are considered the same for Alternative 3 as for the proposed Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Similar to the proposed Project, construction of Alternative 3 could potentially impact water quality related to erosion and pollutants. However, compliance with regulatory requirements and mitigation would ensure these impacts would be less than significant. Although the diving well would be located outside for this alternative and a separate whirlpool for divers would not be included, water quality impacts associated with construction would be similar, since all major components on the Project site would be still be constructed. Alternative 3 would have a reduced building height, but would have a similar amount of impervious surfaces as the proposed Project. With compliance with regulatory requirements, operational impacts would be less than significant for this alternative, similar to the proposed Project. Overall, impacts related to hydrology for Alternative 3 would be similar to the proposed Project.

Land Use. Alternative 3 would include the construction of the Bubble structure, but the structure would be at a reduced height because the diving well would be relocated to the outside of the building. However, similar to the proposed Project, the Bubble structure under Alternative 3 would still exceed the 30-foot height limit and would require a height variance. Under this alternative, as well as the proposed Project, there would be no impacts related to the division of an existing community. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would be consistent with the policies contained in the City's General Plan and the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan. Overall, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not conflict with adjacent land uses and would be consistent with applicable goals and policies from the City's General Plan, the Local Coastal Program, and the City's Zoning Code. Overall, impacts related to land use for Alternative 3 are considered similar to the proposed Project.

Noise. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to noise. Alternative 3 would have a similar duration for construction activities as the proposed project and would therefore have similar construction-related noise impacts.

Alternative 3 would move the diving well outside, as well as the associated seating and outdoor speakers. Crowd noise and whistles from aquatic events performed outside would be greater with the location of these activities outside of the proposed Project's Bubble structure. Although neither the proposed Project nor Alternative 3 would result in significant adverse impacts related to noise during construction or Project operations, overall impacts related to noise would be increased for Alternative 3 due to the diving activities being moved to the outdoor area. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in greater noise impacts as compared to the proposed Project.

Recreation. Under both the proposed Project and Alternative 3, access to the Belmont Veteran's Memorial Pier, parking lots, beach areas, and the pedestrian/bicycle path may be subject to disruption during construction activities. However, both alternatives would include implementation of mitigation requiring a Construction Traffic Management Plan. Construction activities are expected to have less than significant impacts on access to the surrounding off-site recreational facilities.

Alternative 3, similar to the proposed Project, would not result in an increased demand for recreational facilities or require development or expansion of additional recreational facilities. Neither this alternative nor the proposed Project changes the Project site's intended and designated use for recreational purposes. No significant and unavoidable recreational impacts are identified for either the proposed Project or Alternative 3. The total pool surface area for this alternative would be similar to the proposed project, and the demand for programming competitive swimmers, divers, and aquatic sports participants would be met. Therefore, operational recreational impacts are considered similar to the proposed project for this alternative.

Transportation and Circulation. Under both the proposed Project and Alternative 3, potentially significant impacts related to construction traffic and special event traffic could occur. However, both the proposed Project and Alternative 3 would require implementation of mitigation requiring an Event Traffic Management Plan for special events, and a Construction Traffic Management Plan. With these measures, less than significant traffic impacts would occur for both the proposed Project and Alternative 3.

Construction and operational traffic associated with Alternative 3 would be similar since the amount of operational pool space and spectator seating would also be similar to the proposed Project. No significant and unavoidable traffic impacts are identified for either scenario. Overall, traffic impacts would be similar during construction and operations when compared to the Project; therefore, Alternative 3 would have similar traffic impacts than the proposed Project.

Utilities and Service Systems. Alternative 3 includes a similar usable pool area as the proposed Project. There would be similar numbers of visitors and special events, and subsequently, a similar amount of demand for most utilities and service systems. Demand for water, electricity, and natural gas would be the same as the proposed Project. The capacity needs for wastewater, solid waste, and urban runoff would also be similar to the proposed Project. Under Alternative 3, emergency calls for police and fire services are anticipated to be the same as for the proposed Project. No significant and unavoidable utilities and service systems impacts are identified for either scenario. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have similar utilities and service system impacts as the proposed Project.

5.6.3 Attainment of Project Objectives

Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would replace the former Belmont Pool complex with a modern pool complex. However, the site plan under Alternative 3 would be revised to locate the diving well component outside in order to reduce the height of the Bubble structure. This alternative would achieve many of the of the Project objectives, but not to the same extent as the proposed Project.

The relocation of the diving well to the outdoor pool area would result in a similar length of construction required to build the proposed Project, which would minimize the time period that the community is without a state-of-the-art recreation and competitive pool facility (Objective 3). In addition, the height of the Bubble structure would be reduced under Alternative 3, which would reduce the scale of the proposed buildings and improve scenic views of the coastline from inside and outside the facility, as compared to the proposed Project and the former Belmont Pool facility (Objectives 11 and 12). The amount and type of landscaped open space areas under Alternative 3 would be the same as the proposed Project (Objectives 14 and 15). Alternative 3 would provide a new pool complex that is compatible with its seaside location (Objective 6).

Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would provide a pool complex that accommodates swimming, diving, and water polo national/international events that include current competitive standards, in accordance with FINA regulations (Objective 7). However, because Alternative 3 would relocate the diving well to the outdoor pool component, space constraints would require the consolidation of pools and removal of the divers' whirlpool and the loss of an indoor competitive diving facility. Competitive divers and certain competitive events prefer indoor competitive facilities over outdoor facilities. The pool complex would be able to hold the same amount of the special events and public aquatic opportunities as compared to the proposed Project. Alternative 3 would not experience a substantial reduction in usable pool space or aquatic opportunities as a result of the revised site plan, and, therefore, be able to operate a pool facility that generates revenue to help offset the ongoing operation and maintenance costs (Objective 8).

Alternative 3, similar to the proposed Project, would redevelop and replace the former Belmont Pool with a more modern facility comprised of high performance materials that better meet the needs of recreational and competitive swimmers, divers, aquatic sports participants, and additional pool users (Objectives 1, 2, and 10) and increases programmable water space to minimize scheduling conflicts (Objective 5) that occurred during the

operations of the former Belmont Pool facility. Both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project would locate the pool in an area that serves the existing users (Objective 13). Alternative 3 would include a total pool surface area of 36,335 sf, only 115 sf less than the proposed project (due to the loss of the whirlpool for divers). The increase in pool area would be comparable to the proposed Project and would alleviate the overcrowding and schedule conflicts of the former Belmont Pool. Therefore, Alternative 3 would meet the needs of aquatic community, similar to the proposed Project.

The proposed Project would include possible total of 4,250 seats (Objective 4) through the combination of 3,000 temporary outdoor seats for special events and 1,250 permanent indoor seats. By moving the diving well to the outdoor pool component, Alternative 3 would include the reconfiguration of the outdoor pool components, which may result in a reduction of outdoor seating. Alternative 3 is in compliance with the land use goals of Planned Development PD-2 (Objective 9). Therefore, Alternative 3 would meet a majority of the Project Objectives, similar to the proposed Project.

5.6.4 Conclusion

Alternative 3 would move the diving well outside, reducing the pool surface area by only 115 sf. Although the diving well would be located to the outdoor pool component under Alternative 3, impacts related to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, global climate change, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, recreation, traffic, and utilities and service systems impacts would be similar to the proposed Project for this alternative.

Operational-related impacts associated with aesthetics would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project due to the reduced project height. These impacts were determined to be less than significant for the proposed Project, and would remain less than significant for this alternative.

Compared to the proposed Project, operational noise impacts are greater for Alternative 3, as compared to the proposed Project, due to the location of additional activities, such as the diving well, to the outdoor pool area.

Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts. Overall impacts would be incrementally less than the proposed Project with the exception of noise impacts, which would be greater.

5.7 ALTERNATIVE 4: REDUCED PROJECT - NO OUTDOOR COMPONENTS

5.7.1 Description

Alternative 4 is a Reduced Project Alternative, which would eliminate the outdoor pool component, including the recreation pool, competition pool, and the public address system. The indoor component, facility amenities, and building design components would remain in place; however, the size of the Plinth structure would be reduced and be centralized around

the Bubble component of the Project. The removal of the outdoor component would represent an approximately 20–30 percent reduction in the size of the building footprint and an approximately 49 percent reduction in the total pool area as compared to the proposed project. As part of this alternative, the outdoor cafe would remain. A height variance would still be required under this alternative due to indoor diving well.

5.7.2 Environmental Analysis

Aesthetics. Alternative 4 would eliminate the outdoor pool area and would modify the aesthetics of the proposed structure. The removal of the outdoor pool area would include the removal of the Plexiglas barrier and reduce the size of the Plinth, thereby representing a reduction in the overall mass and footprint of the structure as compared to the proposed Project. Because this alternative would be smaller in scale, impacts to views would be reduced as compared to the proposed Project. The open space and park area would increase under this alternative. This alternative would, like the proposed Project, be required to comply with the City’s lighting code, although lighting would be reduced with the elimination of the outdoor pool components. Under this alternative, potential aesthetic impacts related to construction would be reduced compared to impacts under the proposed Project because construction activities would be incrementally reduced. Similar to the proposed Project, visual impacts associated with the Reduced Project Alternative would be considered less than significant. However, Alternative 4 would result in fewer construction and operational visual impacts as compared to the proposed Project due to the reduction in the proposed facilities.

Air Quality. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would have less than significant impacts related to air quality. Construction and operational emissions associated with Alternative 4 would be reduced since the amount of operational pool space would be reduced and fewer vehicle trips would be generated due to the reduced size of the alternative. Overall, air quality impacts would be incrementally reduced during construction when compared to the Project due to the reduced amount of building construction. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would not exceed significance thresholds for criteria pollutants with implementation of mitigation and standard South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) measures. Operational impacts would be reduced with the reduced amount of pool square footage. Overall, there would be fewer air quality emissions; therefore, Alternative 4 would result in fewer air quality impacts than the proposed Project.

Biological Resources. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would have less than significant impacts related to biological resources. Alternative 4, like the proposed Project, would remove vegetation on the Project site to create the open space and park areas. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, implementation of Alternative 4 would include mitigation to reduce potential impacts associated with the removal of on-site ornamental landscaping and associated nesting bird species during the breeding season. This alternative would implement a landscape plan similar to the proposed Project, but would include additional park and open space area. Therefore, biological impacts associated with Alternative 4 are considered to be similar to the proposed Project.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would not significantly impact known cultural resources. No archaeological or historical resources are known to exist at the Project site. However, a sensitive geologic formation, Young Alluvial Floodplain Deposits, have the potential to be encountered at approximately 23 ft below grade. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would involve excavation and construction activities and would be required to adhere to mitigation to protect any unknown archaeological or paleontological resources. Therefore, this alternative's impacts to cultural resources would be similar to the proposed Project.

Geology and Soils. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils with implementation of mitigation and adherence to the recommendations of the geology study and additional testing for corrosive soils. Construction and excavation activities associated with implementation of this alternative would be less than, but similar to those associated with the proposed Project; therefore, impacts to geology and soils would be comparable. Geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative 4 are, therefore, considered to be similar to the proposed Project.

Global Climate Change. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would have less than significant impacts related to GHG emissions and global climate change. Overall, GHG emissions would be incrementally reduced during construction when compared to the proposed Project due to the reduced amount of building construction. Operational emissions would also be reduced due to the reduced amount of square footage and fewer associated vehicle trips. Overall, there would be incrementally fewer GHG emissions; therefore, Alternative 4 would have fewer GHG impacts as compared to the proposed Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would have less than significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. Although there would be reduced construction required for this alternative, Alternative 4 would still be required to implement mitigation measures to reduce impacts associated with regulations for handling hazardous materials during construction activities. Neither the proposed Project nor Alternative 4 would result in significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials during Project operations. Overall, impacts related to hazardous materials are considered the same for Alternative 4 as for the proposed Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Similar to the proposed Project, construction of Alternative 4 could potentially impact water quality related to erosion and pollutants. However, compliance with regulatory requirements and mitigation would ensure these impacts would be less than significant. Water quality impacts associated with construction would be similar, although incrementally reduced for this alternative, since all components on the Project site, with the exception of the outdoor pool components, would be still be constructed. Additionally, Alternative 4 would have a reduced building square footage, and would result

in less impervious surfaces. With compliance with regulatory requirements, operational impacts would be less than significant for this alternative, similar to the proposed Project. Overall, impacts related to hydrology for Alternative 4 would be incrementally fewer than for the proposed Project.

Land Use. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would be constructed up to a maximum height of 75 ft and require a variance for the exceedance of the 30-foot height limit. Under this alternative, as well as the proposed Project, there would be no impacts related to the division of an existing community. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would be consistent with the policies contained in the City's General Plan and the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan. Overall, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would not conflict with adjacent land uses and would be consistent with applicable goals and policies from the City's General Plan, the Local Coastal Program, and the City's Zoning Code. Therefore, impacts related to land use for Alternative 4 are considered similar to the proposed Project.

Noise. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would have less than significant impacts related to noise. However, Alternative 4 would reduce the duration of the construction activities and would, therefore, result in reduced construction-related noise impacts.

Alternative 4 would eliminate the outdoor pool area, as well as the associated temporary bleachers and outdoor speakers. Crowd noise and whistles from aquatic events occurring outside would be eliminated. Although neither the proposed Project nor Alternative 4 would result in significant adverse impacts related to noise during construction or Project operations, overall impacts related to noise would be reduced for Alternative 4 due to the removal of outdoor pool activities. Therefore, Alternative 4 would result in fewer noise impacts as compared to the proposed Project.

Recreation. Under both the proposed Project and Alternative 4, access to the Belmont Veteran's Memorial Pier, parking lots, beach areas, and the pedestrian/bicycle path may be subject to disruption during construction activities. However, both the alternative and the proposed Project would include implementation of mitigation requiring a Construction Traffic Management Plan. Construction activities are expected to have less than significant impacts on access to the surrounding off-site recreational facilities.

Alternative 4, similar to the proposed Project, would not result in an increased demand for recreational facilities or require development or expansion of additional recreational facilities. Neither this alternative nor the proposed Project changes the Project site's use for recreational purposes. Although no significant and unavoidable recreational impacts are identified for either scenario, the proposed Project includes approximately 36,450 square feet (sf) of pool surface area, as compared to a total pool surface area of 18,610 sf under Alternative 4. This is substantially less programmable water area than the proposed Project, and only 200 sf more than the former Belmont facility. Alternative 4 would not allow as many recreational and competitive activities to occur simultaneously. Without substantially increasing the pool

surface area from the former Belmont pool, operational-related recreational impacts are considered greater for this alternative.

Transportation and Circulation. Under both the proposed Project and Alternative 4, potentially significant impacts related to construction traffic and special event traffic could occur. However, both Alternative 4 and the proposed Project would require implementation of mitigation requiring an Event Traffic Management Plan for special events, and a Construction Traffic Management Plan be implemented. With these measures, less than significant traffic impacts would occur for both the proposed Project and Alternative 4.

Construction and operational traffic associated with Alternative 4 would be reduced since the amount of operational pool space and temporary spectator seating would also be reduced resulting in fewer vehicle trips generated. Although no significant and unavoidable traffic impacts are identified for either scenario, because Alternative 4 reduces the amount of construction required and the proposed pool space by approximately 49 percent, traffic impacts are considered to be less for this alternative when compared to the proposed Project. Overall, traffic impacts would be reduced during construction and operations when compared to the Project; therefore, Alternative 4 would have fewer traffic impacts than the proposed Project.

Utilities and Service Systems. Alternative 4 eliminates the outdoor pool, thereby decreasing the usable pool space by approximately 49 percent. The reduced pool space would lead to a reduction in visitors and the number of special events, and subsequently, a reduction in the amount of demand for most utilities and service systems. Demand for water, electricity, and natural gas would also be reduced as there would be less pool area to maintain and heat. The capacity needs for wastewater, solid waste, and, as a result of a decrease in impervious area, urban runoff would be reduced as well. Under Alternative 4, emergency calls for police and fire services are anticipated to be the same or less than for the proposed Project. Although no significant and unavoidable utilities and service systems impacts are identified for either scenario, because Alternative 4 reduces the amount of pool space by approximately 49 percent, utilities and service system impacts are considered to be lower for this alternative when compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have fewer utilities and service system impacts than the proposed Project.

5.7.3 Attainment of Project Objectives

Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would replace the former Belmont Pool complex with a modern pool complex. However, because it would not include outdoor pools, this alternative would achieve some, but not all, of the Project objectives.

The elimination of the outdoor pools would reduce the amount and length of construction required to build the Project, which would minimize the time period that the community is without a state-of-the-art recreation and competitive pool facility (Objective 3). In addition, the smaller building footprint would reduce the mass and scale of the proposed Plinth component and potentially increase landscaped open space areas and provide additional

views of the coastline from inside and outside the facility (Objectives 11, 12, 14, and 15). Therefore, Alternative 4 would provide a new pool complex that is compatible with its seaside location (Objective 6). Both Alternative 4 and the proposed Project would locate the pool in an area that serves the existing users (Objective 13) and would utilize high performance materials for the maximization of sustainability and energy efficiency (Objective 10).

Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would be a pool complex that accommodates swimming, diving, and water polo national/international events that include current competitive standards, in accordance with FINA regulations (Objective 7). However, because Alternative 4 would result in 49 percent less pool space compared to the proposed Project, the pool complex would not be able to hold as many special events and public aquatic opportunities as compared to the proposed Project and would not maximize the potential of the site as an aquatic recreational complex. The facility would also not be able to simultaneously support both competitive and recreational uses. Similarly, although Alternative 4 would be able to operate a pool facility that generates revenue to help offset the ongoing operation and maintenance costs (Objective 8), the reduced pool space would result in a reduced number of special events and associated revenue. Therefore, this alternative would meet Objective 8 to a lesser degree than the proposed project.

Although Alternative 4 would redevelop and replace the former Belmont Pool with a more modern facility that better meets the needs of recreational and competitive swimmers, divers, and aquatic sports participants, (Objectives 1, and 2), and increases programmable water space to minimize scheduling conflicts (Objective 5), it does not meet these objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project. Alternative 4 provides only 330 sf more pool area than the former Belmont Pool facility, and is 49 percent less pool area than the proposed Project. The small increase in pool area would not alleviate the overcrowding and schedule conflicts of the former Belmont Pool as compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not better meet the needs of aquatic community. This alternative would, therefore, be inconsistent with Objectives 2 and 5.

The proposed Project would include a total of 4,250 seats (Objective 4) through the combination of 3,000 temporary outdoor seats for special events and 1,250 permanent indoor seats. By removing the outdoor pool, Objective 4 would not be met because Alternative 4 would eliminate the 3,000 outdoor seats, leaving only 1,250 permanent indoor seats. The indoor diving well would require that the Bubble structure remain at a height that exceeds the limitations provided for the PD-2, similar to the proposed Project, which would require a variance for the structure to comply with the land use goals of Planned Development PD-2 (Objective 9). Therefore, the elimination of the outdoor pools under Alternative 4 would not maximize the potential of the site as an aquatic recreational complex. Although Alternative 4 would meet Project Objectives 1, 7, 11, 12, 14, and 15, it would not meet them or the remaining Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project.

5.7.4 Conclusion

Alternative 4 would eliminate the outdoor pools and reduce the pool surface area by 49 percent as compared to the proposed Project. The Plinth and structural footprint would also

be reduced and would result in an increase in open space. Although the outdoor pool component would be eliminated with Alternative 4, impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, and land use would be similar to the proposed Project for this alternative.

Construction-related aesthetics, hydrology and water quality, air quality, global climate change, noise, and traffic impacts would be fewer than those under the proposed Project because construction activities would be reduced.

Operational-related impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, global climate change, hydrology and water quality, noise, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project. These impacts were determined to be less than significant for the proposed Project, and would remain less than significant for this alternative.

Compared to the proposed Project, recreational impacts are greater for Alternative 4 due to the reduction in available aquatic recreational opportunities as compared to the proposed Project.

Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts. However, due to the elimination of the outdoor pool component under Alternative 4, overall impacts would be incrementally less than the proposed Project with the exception of recreational impacts, which would be greater.

5.8 ALTERNATIVE 5: REDUCED PROJECT - NO DIVING WELL AND NO OUTDOOR COMPONENTS

5.8.1 Description

This alternative would be similar to Alternative 4, but would eliminate the outdoor pool components and the indoor diving well component. The open space and park area would be expanded under this alternative as the footprint of the facility would be reduced. Although this alternative would reduce the height of the building, it would still require a height variance due to the height limitation of 30 ft on the Project site.

5.8.2 Environmental Analysis

Aesthetics. Alternative 5 would eliminate the diving well and outdoor pool area, and, as a result, would modify the aesthetics of the proposed structure. The removal of the outdoor pool area would include the removal of the Plexiglas barrier and reduce the size of the Plinth, thereby representing a reduction in the overall mass and footprint of the structure as compared to the proposed Project. Because this alternative would be smaller in scale, impacts to views would be reduced as compared to the proposed Project. The Bubble interior mezzanines and levels the Beach Cafe, and a majority of the Plinth would still be constructed, but, with removal of the diving well component, the height of the building would be reduced. However, Alternative 5 would still exceed the 30-foot height limit and would require a height variance. Open space and park area would also increase under this alternative. This

alternative would, like the proposed Project, be required to comply with the City's lighting code, although lighting would be reduced with the elimination of the outdoor pool components. Under this alternative, potential aesthetic impacts related to construction would be reduced compared to impacts under the proposed Project because construction activities would be incrementally reduced. Similar to the proposed Project, visual impacts associated with Alternative 5 would be considered less than significant. Alternative 5 would result in fewer visual impacts compared to the proposed Project.

Air Quality. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would have less than significant impacts related to air quality. Construction and operational emissions associated with Alternative 5 would be reduced since the amount of operational pool space would be reduced and fewer vehicle trips would be generated due to the reduced size of the alternative. Overall, air quality impacts would be incrementally reduced during construction when compared to the Project due to the reduced amount of building construction. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would not exceed significance thresholds for criteria pollutants with implementation of mitigation and standard South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) measures. Operational impacts would be reduced with the reduced amount of pool square footage. Overall, there would be fewer air quality emissions; therefore, Alternative 5 would result in fewer air quality impacts than the proposed Project.

Biological Resources. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would have less than significant impacts related to biological resources. Alternative 5, like the proposed Project, would remove vegetation on the Project site to create the open space and park areas. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, implementation of Alternative 5 would include mitigation to reduce potential impacts associated with the removal of on-site ornamental landscaping and associated nesting bird species during the breeding season. This alternative would implement a landscape plan similar to the proposed Project, but with more open space and park area. Therefore, biological impacts associated with Alternative 5 are considered to be similar to the proposed Project.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would not significantly impact known cultural resources. No archaeological or historical resources are known to exist at the Project site. However, a sensitive geologic formation, Young Alluvial Floodplain Deposits, have the potential to be encountered at approximately 23 ft below grade. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would involve excavation and construction activities and would be required to adhere to mitigation to protect any unknown archaeological or paleontological resources. Therefore, this alternative's impacts to cultural resources would be similar to the proposed Project.

Geology and Soils. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils with implementation of mitigation and adherence to the recommendations of the geology study and additional testing for corrosive soils. Construction and excavation activities associated with implementation of this

alternative would be less than, but similar to those associated with the proposed Project; therefore, impacts to geology and soils would be comparable. Geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative 5 are, therefore, considered to be similar to the proposed Project.

Global Climate Change. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would have less than significant impacts related to GHG emissions and global climate change. Overall, GHG emissions would be incrementally reduced during construction when compared to the proposed Project due to the lessened amount of building construction. Operational emissions would also be reduced with the reduced amount of square footage and fewer vehicle trips. Overall, there would be incrementally fewer GHG emissions; therefore, Alternative 5 would have fewer GHG impacts as compared to the proposed Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would have less than significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. Although there would be reduced construction required for this alternative, Alternative 5 would still be required to implement mitigation measures to reduce impacts associated with regulations for handling hazardous materials during construction activities. Neither the proposed Project nor Alternative 5 would result in significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials during Project operations. Overall, impacts related to hazardous materials are considered the same for Alternative 5 as for the proposed Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Similar to the proposed Project, construction of Alternative 5 could potentially impact water quality related to erosion and pollutants. However, compliance with regulatory requirements and mitigation would ensure these impacts would be less than significant. Water quality impacts associated with construction would be similar, although incrementally reduced for this alternative, since all of the components on the Project site, with the exception of the outdoor pool components and the diving well, would be still be constructed. Additionally, Alternative 5 would have a reduced building square footage, and would also have a reduced amount of impervious surfaces. With compliance with regulatory requirements, operational impacts would be less than significant for this alternative, similar to the proposed Project. Overall, impacts related to hydrology for Alternative 5 would be incrementally less than for the proposed Project.

Land Use. Unlike the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would not include the indoor diving well; however a variance would still be required for the exceedance of the 30-foot height limit. Under this alternative, as well as the proposed Project, there would be no impacts related to the division of an existing community. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would be consistent with the policies contained in the City's General Plan and the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan. Overall, similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would not conflict with adjacent land uses and would be consistent with applicable goals and policies from the City's General Plan, the Local Coastal Program, and the City's Zoning Code. Therefore, impacts related to land use for Alternative 5 are similar to the proposed Project.

Noise. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would have less than significant impacts related to noise. However, Alternative 5 would reduce the duration of the construction activities and would, therefore, result in reduced construction-related noise impacts. Alternative 5 would also eliminate the outdoor pool area, as well as the associated temporary bleachers and outdoor speakers. Crowd noise and whistles from aquatic events performed outside would also be eliminated. Although neither the proposed Project nor Alternative 5 would result in significant adverse impacts related to noise during construction or Project operations, overall impacts related to noise would be reduced for Alternative 5. Therefore, Alternative 5 would result in fewer noise impacts as compared to the proposed Project.

Recreation. Under both the proposed Project and Alternative 5, access to the Belmont Veteran's Memorial Pier, parking lots, beach areas, and the pedestrian/bicycle path may be subject to disruption during construction activities. However, both the proposed Project and Alternative 5 would include implementation of mitigation requiring a Construction Traffic Management Plan. Construction activities are expected to have less than significant impacts on access to the surrounding off-site recreational facilities.

Alternative 2, similar to the proposed Project, would not result in an increased demand for recreational facilities but could require development or expansion of additional recreational facilities in order to meet the needs of the competitive swimming, diving, and water polo communities. Neither this alternative nor the proposed Project changes the Project site's use for recreational purposes. Although no significant and unavoidable recreational impacts are identified for either scenario, Alternative 5 would include a total pool surface area of 14,290 sf or less, increasing the indoor surface water area of the former Belmont Pool facility by only 280 sf. Without substantially increasing the pool surface area from the former Belmont pool, recreational and competitive activities could not occur simultaneously, and the demand for programming competitive swimmers, divers, and aquatic sports participants would not be met. Therefore, operational recreational impacts are considered greater than the proposed project for this alternative.

Transportation and Circulation. Under both the proposed Project and Alternative 5, potentially significant impacts related to construction traffic and special event traffic could occur. However, both alternatives would include implementation of mitigation requiring an Event Traffic Management Plan for special events, and a Construction Traffic Management Plan. With these measures, less than significant traffic impacts would occur.

Construction and operational traffic associated with Alternative 5 would be reduced since the amount of operational pool space and temporary spectator seating would also be reduced resulting in fewer vehicle trips generated. Although no significant and unavoidable traffic impacts are identified for either scenario, because Alternative 5 reduces the amount of construction required and the proposed pool space by approximately 49 percent, traffic impacts are considered to be fewer for this alternative when compared to the proposed

Project. Overall, Alternative 5 traffic impacts would be reduced during construction and operations when compared to the Project.

Utilities and Service Systems. Alternative 5 eliminates the outdoor pool, thereby decreasing the usable pool space by approximately 49 percent. The reduced pool space would lead to a reduction in visitors and the number of special events, and subsequently, a reduction in the amount of demand for most utilities and service systems. Demand for water, electricity, and natural gas would be reduced, as there would be less pool area to maintain and heat. The capacity needs for wastewater, solid waste, and, as a result of a decrease in impervious area, urban runoff would be reduced as well. Under Alternative 5, emergency calls for police and fire services are anticipated to be the same or less than for the proposed Project. Although no significant and unavoidable utilities and service systems impacts are identified for either scenario, because Alternative 5 reduces the amount of pool space by approximately 49 percent, utilities and service system impacts are considered to be less for this alternative when compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative 5 would have fewer utilities and service system impacts than the proposed Project.

5.8.3 Attainment of Project Objectives

Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would replace the former Belmont Pool complex with a modern pool complex. However, because it would not include outdoor pools or the diving well component, this alternative would achieve some, but not all, of the Project objectives as the proposed Project.

The elimination of the outdoor pools and the diving well component would reduce the amount and length of construction required to build the Project, which would minimize the time period that the community is without a state-of-the-art recreation and competitive pool facility (Objective 3). In addition, the smaller project footprint would reduce the mass and scale of the proposed Plinth component, increasing landscaped open space areas, and providing additional views of the coastline from inside and outside the facility (Objectives 11, 12, 14, and 15). Therefore, Alternative 5 would provide a new pool complex that is compatible with its seaside location (Objective 6).

Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would accommodate swimming and water polo national/international events that include current competitive standards, in accordance with FINA regulations (Objective 7). However, because Alternative 5 would remove the diving well component and approximately 49 percent of the programmable pool space, the pool complex would not be able to hold the same number of special events and public aquatic opportunities as compared to the proposed Project. Similarly, although Alternative 5 would be able to operate a pool facility that generates revenue to help offset the ongoing operation and maintenance costs (Objective 8), the lack of a diving well and reduced pool space would result in a reduced number of special events and associated revenue. Therefore, this alternative would meet Objective 8 to a lesser degree than the proposed Project.

Although Alternative 5 would redevelop and replace the former Belmont Pool with a more modern facility that better meets the needs of recreational and competitive swimmers, divers,

and aquatic sports participants, (Objectives 1, and 2), and increases programmable water space to minimize scheduling conflicts (Objective 5), it does not meet these objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project. Alternative 5 provides only 200 sf more pool area than the former Belmont Pool facility, and is 49 percent less pool area than the proposed Project. The small increase in pool area would not alleviate the overcrowding and schedule conflicts of the former Belmont Pool as compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative 5 would not better meet the needs of aquatic community. This alternative would, therefore, be inconsistent with Objectives 2 and 5.

The proposed Project would include a total of 4,250 seats (Objective 4) through the combination of 3,000 temporary outdoor seats for special events and 1,250 permanent indoor seats. By removing the outdoor pool, Objective 4 would not be met because Alternative 5 would eliminate the 3,000 outdoor seats, leaving only 1,250 permanent indoor seats. Although the indoor diving well would be removed, the structure would still remain at a height that exceeds the limitations provided for the PD-2, similar to the proposed Project, which would require a variance for the structure to comply with the land use goals of Planned Development PD-2 (Objective 9). Therefore, the elimination of the outdoor pools under Alternative 5 would not maximize the potential of the site as an aquatic recreational complex. Although Alternative 5 would meet Project Objectives 1, 7, 11, 12, 14, and 15, it would not meet them or the remaining Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project.

5.8.4 Conclusion

Alternative 5 would eliminate the outdoor pools and diving well component, and, as a result, reduce the pool surface area by approximately 49 percent. The Plinth and structural footprint would also be reduced and would result in an increase in open space. Although the outdoor pools and diving well component would be eliminated with Alternative 5, impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, and land use would be similar to the proposed Project for this alternative.

Construction-related hydrology and water quality, air quality, global climate change, noise, and traffic impacts would be fewer than those under the proposed Project because construction activities would be reduced.

Operational-related impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, global climate change, hydrology and water quality, noise, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project. These impacts were determined to be less than significant for the proposed Project, and would remain less than significant for this alternative.

Compared to the proposed Project, recreational impacts are greater for Alternative 5 due to the reduction in available recreational opportunities as compared to the proposed Project.

Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts. However, due to the elimination of the outdoor pools and diving well component under the reduced Project Alternative, overall impacts would be incrementally less than the proposed Project with the exception of recreational impacts, which would be greater.

5.9 IDENTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires the identification of an Environmentally Superior Alternative. The *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(2) states that if the No Project Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative among the other alternatives. Table 5.B provides, in summary format, a comparison of the level of impacts for each alternative to the proposed Project.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed Project on the basis of the lack of physical impacts that would occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative. While the No Project Alternative would lessen or avoid the impacts of the proposed Project, the beneficial impacts of the proposed Project—including the provisions of an aquatic recreational complex not currently provided by the City—would not occur, and none of the Project objectives would be met. Overall, however, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior because the physical impacts associated with this alternative are significantly less than the proposed Project and other as alternatives.

The *State CEQA Guidelines* require that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, “the EIR also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives” (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(20)). The Environmentally Superior Alternative, in terms of direct physical effects on the environment, is Alternative 5, No Diving Well and No Outdoor Pool Component/ Reduced Project.

Alternative 5 would eliminate the outdoor pool component and reduce the overall footprint and height of the pool structure, thereby reducing construction-related hydrology and water quality, air quality, global climate change, noise, and traffic impacts. Therefore, direct physical effects on the environment as a result of construction would be reduced as compared to the proposed Project.

Compared to the proposed Project, recreational impacts are greater for Alternative 5 due to the reduction in available recreational opportunities as compared to the proposed Project. However, operational-related impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, global climate change, hydrology and water quality, noise, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project. Alternative 5 includes the reduction of aquatic opportunities that would subsequently lead to a reduction in visitors and operational requirements, thereby resulting in an overall lessening of environmental impacts compared to the proposed Project. Although Alternative 5 would be considered environmentally superior, the reduction of recreational facilities would not achieve the goals and objectives of the proposed Project, and would not be consistent with the primary objective of the City, which is to replace the former Belmont Pool with a more modern facility that better meets the needs of the local community, region and State’s recreational and competitive swimmers, divers, aquatic sports participants, and additional pool users due to the tremendous demand for these services in the local community, region and State.

Table 5.B: Comparison of the Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project to the Project Alternatives

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project: Level of Impacts After Mitigation	Alternative 1: No Project/ No New Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Maintain Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses	Alternative 3: Outdoor Diving Well/Revised Site Plan	Alternative 4: No Outdoor Components/ Reduced Project	Alternative 5: No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components/ Reduced Project
Aesthetics	Less Than Significant	L	L	L	L	L
Air Quality	Less Than Significant	L	L	S	L	L
Biological Resources	Less Than Significant	L	L	S	S	S
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Less Than Significant	L	S	S	S	S
Geology and Soils	Less Than Significant	L	S	S	S	S
Global Climate Change	Less Than Significant	L	L	S	L	L
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less Than Significant	L	S	S	S	S
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less Than Significant	G	L	S	L	L
Land Use	Less Than Significant	G	G	S	S	S
Noise	Less Than Significant	L	S	G	L	L
Recreation	Less Than Significant	G	G	S	G	G
Transportation and Circulation	Less Than Significant	L	L	S	L	L
Utilities and Service Systems	Less Than Significant	L	L	S	L	L
Attainment of Project Objectives	Meets all of the Project objectives	Meets only two of the Project objectives	Meets a few of the Project objectives but not to the same degree as the proposed Project	Meets most of the Project objectives, but not to the same degree as the proposed Project	Meets some of the Project objectives but not to the same degree as the proposed Project	Meets some of the Project objectives but not to the same degree as the proposed Project

Source: LSA Associates, Inc. (February 2016).

Legend:

L = Less impacts than the proposed Project; reduces or eliminates significant and adverse impacts

S = Similar impacts as the proposed Project; does not eliminate significant and adverse impacts

G = Greater impacts than the proposed Project

This page intentionally left blank