

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” (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6). This chapter identifies potential alternatives to the proposed General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Elements Project (proposed project) and evaluates them as required by CEQA.

Key provisions of the *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]).

5.2 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES

Section 21100 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines* require an EIR to identify and discuss a No Project Alternative and a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project and that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts. Based on the criteria listed above, the No Project Alternative, Areas of Change Reduction/Reduced Project Alternative, Reduced VMT Alternative/Transit-Oriented Alternative, and Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative have been selected to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the proposed project. Therefore, the alternatives considered in this EIR include the following:

- **Alternative 1: No Project.** This Alternative would involve no amendments to the City's General Plan, no adoption of PlaceTypes, and no changes to the existing land use designations in the City. The existing General Plan Land Use Element (LUE) and the Scenic Routes Element (SRE) would continue to determine land uses and design principles that guide future development in the City.
- **Alternative 2: Areas of Change Reduction/Reduced Project Alternative.** This Alternative would include the same PlaceTypes as the proposed project, but would reduce the intensity of land uses in three areas: Mid-City, Downtown, and Traffic Circle. Reductions in land use intensity in these areas would be accomplished through caps on building heights in the Downtown area, reducing the amount of in-fill and regional serving uses in the Mid-City area, and reducing or eliminating new commercial and in-fill development in the Traffic Circle area.
- **Alternative 3: Reduced VMT Alternative/Transit-Oriented Alternative.** The Reduced Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) Alternative would implement only the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone. This Alternative would recognize the objectives of Senate Bill 743 by reducing VMT per capita in order to improve the efficiency of the transportation network. This alternative would be an amendment to the City's existing LUE and would be implemented as an Overlay Zone intended to focus on development around existing and/or proposed transit to reduce the frequency and length of trips. Alternative 3 would not include a new UDE, but would amend the SRE to include design guidelines within the Transit-Oriented PlaceType/Overlay Zone.
- **Alternative 4: Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative.** The Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative would include the same PlaceTypes as the proposed project, but would eliminate the residential component from the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors PlaceType. The overall 2040 Build Out square footage would remain consistent with the proposed project.

Table 5.A provides a summary of the relative impacts and feasibility of each Alternative. A complete discussion of each Alternative is provided below.

Table 5.A: Summary of Project Alternatives

Alternative	Description	Basis for Selection and Summary Analysis
Proposed Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 50 square miles planning area • New Land Use Element (LUE) • New Urban Design Element (UDE) • 14 PlaceTypes • 2040 General Plan Build Out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Population increase of 51,230 persons ○ Employment increase of 28,511 jobs ○ Net increase of 11,744 units <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 664 single family units ■ 11,081 multi-family units ○ Increase of 15,093,000 square feet (sf) of non-residential uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets all project objectives • Requires General Plan Update/Amendment, along with future Local Coastal Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment for consistency with existing planning and policy documents • Refer to Chapters 3.0 and 4.0 of this Draft EIR
Alternative 1: No Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuation of the City’s existing General Plan LUE and SRE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required by CEQA • Does not require General Plan Update/Amendment, Local Coastal Plan Amendment, or Zoning Amendment • Inconsistent with a majority of the Project Objectives
Alternative 2: Areas of Change Reduction/Reduced Project Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 50 square miles planning area • New Land Use Element • New Urban Design Element • 14 PlaceTypes • Caps on Building Heights in Downtown Area • Reduced infill and regional-serving uses in Mid-City Area • Reduced infill development in Traffic Circle Area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires General Plan Update/Amendment, along with future Local Coastal Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment for consistency with existing planning and policy documents • Reduced air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG), and traffic impacts due to reductions in land use intensity where largest increases in traffic volumes were to occur under the proposed project • Results in fewer daily traffic trips than the proposed project • Consistent with some of the project objectives

Table 5.A: Summary of Project Alternatives

Alternative	Description	Basis for Selection and Summary Analysis
Alternative 3: Reduced VMT Alternative/Transit-Oriented Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 50 square miles planning area • Update to existing Land Use Element • Update to existing Scenic Routes Element • 2 New PlaceTypes/Overlay Zones (Transit Oriented Development - Low and Moderate) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires General Plan Update/Amendment and future Local Coastal Plan Amendment (potential) and Zoning Amendment for consistency with existing planning and policy documents • Reduced air quality, GHG, and traffic impacts due to focused development around transit • Consistent with some of the project objectives
Alternative 4: Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 50 square miles planning area • New Land Use Element • New Urban Design Element • 14 PlaceTypes • No residential uses permitted in the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors PlaceTypes (Low and Moderate) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires General Plan Update/Amendment, and future Local Coastal Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment for consistency with existing planning and policy documents • Reduced air quality, GHG, and traffic impacts due to reductions in vehicle trips in the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors PlaceTypes. • Consistent with some of the project objectives

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

For each Alternative, the analysis provides the following:

- Description of the Alternative;
- Environmental analysis of the potential impacts of the Alternative and the significance of those impacts (per the *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's objectives; whether it would eliminate or reduce impacts compared to the project; and its other comparative merits.

5.3 ALTERNATIVES INITIALLY CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

The following is a discussion of the development alternatives considered during the environmental review process and the reasons they were not selected for detailed analysis in this Draft EIR.

5.3.1 Reducing SEADIP

This Alternative would include the same 14 PlaceTypes included in the proposed project, but would reduce the intensity of land uses in the Southeast Area Development and Improvement Plan (SEADIP) area. The SEADIP area would experience the greatest traffic volume increases under the proposed project. Current planning efforts to update the SEADIP, which covers 1,500-acres of southeast Long Beach, are reflected in the proposed project. The proposed project analyzed in this Draft EIR maintains consistency with the current SEADIP goals, policies, and development standards in the planning area. Therefore, any reductions to land use intensities in this planning area would potentially conflict with goals and policies established in this plan and current efforts to update the Local Coastal Plan. Therefore, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

5.3.2 Alternative Sites Considered

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focuses on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant impacts of the project. The key question and first step in the analysis 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 (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6[f][2][A]). If it is determined that no feasible alternative locations exist, the EIR must disclose the reasons for this conclusion (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6[f][2][B]). The proposed project is the implementation of an updated General Plan LUE and a new General Plan UDE for the City. The proposed project encompasses the entire boundaries of the City. Because the City does not have jurisdiction over areas outside of its boundaries and cannot impose General Plan policies on such areas, no alternative sites were considered.

5.4 PROPOSED PROJECT

5.4.1 Project Characteristics

As described earlier in Chapter 3.0, Project Description, the proposed project would result in an update to the City's existing General Plan. The proposed project includes the approval of both the General Plan LUE and UDE, which would replace the existing LUE and SRE.

The proposed LUE would replace the existing 1989 General Plan LUE. The proposed updated LUE would introduce the concept of "PlaceTypes," which would replace the current approach in the existing LUE of segregating property within the City through traditional land uses designations and zoning classifications. The updated LUE would establish 14 primary PlaceTypes that would divide the City into distinct neighborhoods, thus allowing for greater flexibility and a mix of compatible land

uses within these areas (refer to Figure 3.3, Proposed PlaceTypes). Each PlaceType would be defined by unique land use, form, and character-defining goals, policies, and implementation strategies tailored specifically to the particular application of that PlaceType within the City.

The existing General Plan does not currently include an UDE. The UDE would define the physical aspects of the urban environment. Specifically, the UDE aims to further enhance the City's PlaceTypes established in the LUE by creating great places; improving the urban fabric, and public spaces; and defining edges, thoroughfares, and corridors (see Figures 3.6.a and 3.6.b, Urban Design Principles in Commercial and Residential Areas, respectively). In addition, the City intends to utilize the UDE to foster healthy, sustainable neighborhoods; promote compact and connected development; minimize and fill in gaps in the urban fabric of existing neighborhoods; improve the cohesion between buildings, roadways, public spaces, and people; and improve the economic vitality of the City.

As illustrated in Chapter 3.0, Project Description, and Table 3.B, Project Buildout Summary, compared to existing conditions, the proposed LUE would allow for a population increase of 51,230 persons, an employment increase of 28,511, and a net increase of 11,744 units by the year 2040. More specifically, as illustrated by Tables 3.B through 3.D, the proposed project would allow for an increase in 11,744 dwelling units (664 and 11,081 single family and multi-family, respectively), an increase of 15,093,000 square feet (sf) of non-residential uses, and an increase in population and employment by 51,230 people and 28,511 jobs, respectively. These projected increases in housing units, population, and employment are consistent with 2016-2040 growth projections developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for the region.

5.4.2 Project Objectives

Each Alternative is analyzed to determine whether it achieves the basic objectives of the proposed project. As stated in Section 3.0, Project Description, the City has established the following intended specific objectives for the General Plan updated LUE and new UDE that would serve to aid decision-makers in their review of the proposed project and its associated environmental impacts:

1. Promote livability, including environmental quality, community health and safety, the quality of the built environment, and economic vitality.
2. Accommodate strategic growth in the Downtown area, around regional-serving facilities, along major corridors, and in transit-oriented development areas; create and preserve open space; accommodate economic development by converting industrial areas to neo-industrial uses in appropriate locations, promote regional-serving uses, convert industrial uses to commercial uses in locations more suitable for commercial character, and revitalize the Waterfront areas.
3. Implement sustainable planning and development practices by creating compact new developments and walkable neighborhoods to minimize the City's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) and energy usage.
4. Create job growth allowing for new businesses while also maintaining and preserving existing employment opportunities at the City's regional facilities and employment centers. Promote increased employment opportunities for Long Beach residents at differing levels of educational and skill attainment.

5. Promote changes in land use and development that reflect changes in the regional economy. Promote land uses that transform now-vacant former employment centers into new sources of employment.
6. Meet the City's housing needs by diversifying housing opportunities through the provision of a variety of housing types and the provision of market-rate and affordable housing units.
7. Provide high-quality housing in a variety of forms, sizes, and densities to serve the diverse population of the City.
8. Preserve low-density neighborhoods while improving pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access in these areas.
9. Ensure fair and equitable land use by making planning decisions that would ensure the fair and equitable distribution of services, amenities, and investments throughout the City.
10. Provide reliable public facilities and infrastructure by expanding and maintaining the current infrastructure to serve new and existing developments in the City.
11. Increase access to green and open space through the creation of urban open spaces and greenscapes and providing for clean beaches, waterways, preserves, and parklands.
12. Restore and reconnect with local natural reserves through the utilization of clean energy, best management practices (BMPs), and current technologies.
13. Create "Great Places" places by improving the connectivity, the visual appearance of and development of public spaces; promote sustainable design practices; encourage design techniques that foster economic development; preserve historic districts and the unique character of each neighborhood; provide for public art; and expand the unified sign program to increase wayfinding within neighborhoods and PlaceTypes.
14. Improve the urban fabric by creating complete neighborhoods and community blocks, properly place and design new development to prevent visual and land use conflicts; promote compact urban and infill development, clearly define boundaries between natural and urbanized areas, preserve iconic buildings; and provide pedestrian furniture and wide sidewalks to create walkable blocks.
15. Preserve the City's natural features, open space, and parks throughout the City, while also providing new public spaces throughout the community, parks, and plazas at infill sites, and parklets along sidewalks.
16. Encourage building form and design to improve the interface between buildings and streets; develop areas along public sidewalks that promote streets as "public rooms;" design parking lots and access points to be pedestrian-friendly; provide buffers along streetscapes to buffer parking areas and promote walkability; provide bicycle infrastructure; establish safe transit infrastructure; and design streetscapes utilizing sustainable streetscape strategies.
17. Promote high-quality design of the built environment. Enhance visual interest, improve functionality and inspire pride through thoughtful design, high-quality materials and a diversity of architectural styles throughout neighborhoods and the entire City.

5.4.3 Significant Unavoidable Impacts of the Proposed Project

The analysis in the Initial Study (IS) (Appendix A of this Draft EIR) for the proposed project determined that the proposed project would result in either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the following topics: agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, and recreation. As described in Chapter 4.0, Existing Environmental Setting, Environmental Analysis, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to aesthetics, land use, population and housing, noise, public services and utilities. The proposed project would result in significant unavoidable impacts related to air quality (long-term operational impacts and impacts to sensitive receptors), GHG emissions (GHG emissions would exceed the State Service Population threshold of 3.4 metric tons [MT] carbon dioxide equivalent [CO₂e] per year), and transportation/traffic (significant and adverse impacts at 44 intersections).

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 mitigation measures required for project implementation would apply to the project alternatives and similar reductions in impacts would be achieved through such mitigation. 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.

5.5 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

5.5.1 Description

Consistent with Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the No Project Alternative assumes the existing land uses and condition of the planning area at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published (May 2015) would continue to exist without changes. The setting of the planning area at the time the NOP was published is described throughout Chapter 4.0 of this EIR with respect to individual environmental issues, and forms the baseline of the impact assessment of the proposed project. The No Project Alternative anticipates that the adopted General Plan LUE and SRE would continue to determine land use and scenic vistas within the City without any improvements or changes to land use designations. This alternative assumes that future development would continue to occur as currently allowed under the General Plan LUE.

As previously stated, the existing 1989 LUE contains a General Plan Land Use Map and a discussion of the intended and allowable uses within each land use type. The existing LUE determines land use on a parcel-by-parcel basis. In addition to a description and map of land use categories, the existing 1989 LUE establishes goals and objectives aimed at guiding the orderly pattern of development in the City.

The existing General Plan does not currently include an UDE. However, the existing SRE designates roadways within the City for which view protection should be considered and also establishes varying design standards to ensure the continued maintenance of the aesthetic character of these roadways.

The No Project Alternative would allow for the existing LUE and SRE to continue to function as they currently do into the foreseeable future. There would be no improvements implemented in the planning area. In addition, the proposed General Plan Update/Amendment, Local Coastal Plan

Amendment, and Zoning Amendment allowing the update of applicable planning and policy documents would not occur. The No Project Alternative would allow the existing General Plan LUE and SRE to remain unchanged.

5.5.2 Environmental Analysis

The planning area includes the entire 50 square miles within the limits of the City of Long Beach. The City is currently developed with urban and suburban uses. The City is bordered on the west by the Cities of Carson and Los Angeles (including Wilmington and the Port of Los Angeles); on the north by the Cities of Compton, Paramount, and Bellflower; and on the east by the Cities of Lakewood, Hawaiian Gardens, Cypress, Los Alamitos, and Seal Beach. The City is also bordered by the unincorporated communities of Rancho Dominguez to the north and Rossmoor to the east.

The following impact determinations are made after the consideration of General Plan build out consistent with the existing adopted LUE and SRE. Under the No Project Alternative, the visual setting of the planning area would remain as guided by the development standards currently adopted under the existing LUE, SRE, Municipal Code, and/or Specific Plans. No additional air pollutant emissions or greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be generated by new vehicle trips or short-term construction beyond development consistent with the existing General Plan. The existing land uses would continue to be consistent with the City's General Plan and zoning documents, and no General Plan Update/Amendment, Local Coastal Plan Amendment, or Zoning Amendment would be required. No additional short-term construction noise impacts or long-term operational noise impacts would occur to the surrounding area other than those effects already considered under the adopted General Plan. No additional population over the adopted projections for the General Plan would result from the continued existing uses and conditions in the planning area would occur. No additional demands for fire or police services, other than those effects already considered to occur under the adopted General Plan, would occur, and no additional or increased demand for recreational facilities beyond those of the adopted General Plan would result for the No Project Alternative. Further, no additional vehicle trips would be generated by construction or operations in the planning area, no new sources of solid waste would be created, and no increase in demand for electricity or natural gas would occur beyond demand accounted for under projects consistent with the adopted General Plan.

5.5.3 Overview of Potential Impact/Comparison to Proposed Project

The No Project Alternative would not require a General Plan Update/Amendment, Local Coastal Plan Amendment, or Rezone Amendment. No change to the adopted land use designations would occur and therefore no new environmental impacts would occur. Although overall impacts for the No Project Alternative would be similar to the Proposed Project, significant traffic impacts would be reduced at 44 intersections because the potential for increased population and employment would not occur as it would with the proposed PlaceTypes, which have the potential to increase intensity in some locations. In addition, under the No Project scenario, there would be no significant and adverse construction air quality emissions, and significant and adverse GHG emissions related to Service Population thresholds. Overall, environmental impacts would be reduced under this alternative.

5.5.4 Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the 17 project objectives. Without the proposed project, future development in the planning area would not be required to be consistent with the proposed LUE and UDE. The No Project Alternative would not help the City achieve its goal of creating great places through the establishment of new PlaceTypes and urban design principles not currently provided in the City's General Plan. Furthermore, this Alternative would not include the provision for new housing and employment opportunities to accommodate future growth projections for the City, nor would it expand the economic base of the City.

5.6 ALTERNATIVE 2: AREAS OF CHANGE REDUCTION/REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

5.6.1 Description

This Alternative assumes the planning area would be subject to the LUE and UDE goals, strategies, and policies similar to those included under the proposed project, but with adjustments to the proposed PlaceType intensities. This Alternative would decrease overall intensities by placing caps on building heights in the Downtown area, reducing infill and regional serving uses in the Mid-City Area, and reducing or eliminating new commercial and in-fill development in the Traffic Circle Area. For purposes of the Alternatives analysis, the following reductions in PlaceTypes have been made for Alternative 2:

- 10% reduction for Multi-Family Moderate, Neighborhood Serving Centers and Corridors – Moderate, and Community Commercial
- 33% reduction for Downtown Residential, Commercial and Office
- 10% reduction for Regional Serving Facility Commercial and Office

The eliminated square footage from these three areas would not be redistributed to other areas in the City. Alternative 2 would require a General Plan Update/Amendment, and a future Local Coastal Plan Amendment and Rezone Amendment, similar to the proposed project. Table 5.B summarizes the uses assumed in the planning area under this Alternative.

5.6.2 Environmental Analysis

Aesthetics. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources, light, glare, and the existing visual character of the planning area and its surroundings. As previously stated, Alternative 2 would reduce building intensity in the Downtown, Mid-City, and Traffic Circle areas through caps on building heights and a reduction of new development and uses in these three areas. Unlike the proposed project, buildings proposed as part of Alternative 2 would be constructed at a reduced heights in the Downtown Area. Furthermore, this Alternative would, like the proposed project, be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code, which includes lighting and landscaping standards. Overall, the building square footage in the Downtown, Mid-City, and Traffic Circle areas site would be less than that of the proposed project due to reductions in the intensity of these uses in these three areas. Therefore, while this Alternative

Table 5.B: Alternative 2: Square Footage General Plan Buildout

PlaceTypes	Residential Units			Non-Residential Building Square Footage				
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Total	Commercial	Office	Industrial	Public Facilities/ Institutional	Total
Open Space	-	-	-	782,200	29,300	144,000	4,325,400	5,280,900
Neighborhood	59,898	50,936	110,834	5,388,800	902,900	407,100	11,158,100	17,856,900
Multi-Family – Low	719	7,099	7,818	60,300	2,800	-	99,200	162,300
Multi-Family – Moderate	813	11,827	12,640	-	-	-	-	-
Neighborhood Serving Centers and Corridors – Low	836	4,736	5,572	2,413,300	198,400	199,600	175,300	2,986,600
Neighborhood Serving Centers and Corridors – Moderate	711	9,540	10,251	2,313,915	275,595	378,955	120,000	3,088,465
Community Commercial	113	3,019	3,132	5,360,900	427,000	1,702,400	229,100	7,719,400
Transit-Oriented Development - Low	321	2,800	3,121	1,184,840	226,860	9,500	283,200	1,704,400
Transit-Oriented Development - Moderate	401	1,825	2,226	993,500	64,800	8,800	212,900	1,280,000
Neo-Industrial	54	1,406	1,460	364,700	14,200	1,575,200	17,700	1,971,800
Industrial	145	846	991	291,200	325,600	4,789,700	143,700	5,550,200
Downtown	355	8,077	8,432	1,634,398	3,058,148	59,697	729,000	5,481,243
Waterfront	7	3,126	3,133	2,125,200	898,000	-	605,700	3,628,900
Regional Serving Facility	6	1,104	1,110	552,615	970,140	15,148,510	6,336,500	23,007,765
Proposed Project 2040 Total	64,598	110,940	175,538	24,484,100	8,977,500	25,240,600	24,435,800	83,138,000
Alternative 2 2040 Total	64,379	106,341	170,720	23,465,868	7,393,743	24,423,462	24,435,800	79,718,873
Δ	-219	-4,599	-4,818	-1,018,232	-1,583,757	-817,138	0	-3,419,127

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

would result in a less dense and smaller project, the overall visual changes would be reduced most significantly in the Downtown area, but also reduced visual changes in the Mid-City and Traffic Circle areas. Therefore, the overall visual impacts of Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less than those of the proposed project.

Air Quality. Because Alternative 2 includes all PlaceTypes with a total 2040 buildout of 170,720 residential units and 79,718,873 sf of non-residential uses it would, similar to the proposed project, have significant adverse impacts related to operational air quality. However, potential operational emissions associated with Alternative 2 would be less than the Proposed Project because this Alternative reduces the potential square footage of building through reductions in land use intensities in the Downtown, Mid-City, and Traffic Circle areas, also resulting in reduced vehicular trips. Similarly, like the Proposed Project, Alternative 2 could exceed significance thresholds for criteria pollutants during construction; however, with the implementation of mitigation and standard South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) measures, such construction impacts would be less than significant. Air quality impacts would be incrementally reduced during construction when compared to the project due to the reduced amount of building construction. Alternative 2 could also result in significant adverse impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants, as well as substantial pollutant concentrations, even with mitigation incorporated, similar to the Proposed Project. Overall, there would be fewer air quality emissions for Alternative 2 as compared to the proposed project, but impacts would remain significant and adverse.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Because Alternative 2 includes all PlaceTypes with a total 2040 buildout of 170,720 residential units and 79,718,873 sf of non-residential uses it would, similar to the proposed project, have significant impacts related to GHG emissions and global climate change as GHG emissions would exceed the Service Population threshold of 3.4 MT CO₂e per year by 2.5 MT CO₂e per year (for a total of 5.9 MT CO₂e per year). Under this Alternative and the proposed project, future development would be designed to meet and exceed all Title 24 standards, which would reduce energy consumption. Overall, GHG emissions would be incrementally less during construction when compared to the proposed project due to the reductions in land use intensities in the Downtown, Mid-City, and Traffic Circle areas. Specifically, GHG emissions would be lower due to the reduced amount of building materials that would need to be produced and transported to the planning area to complete the construction. Operational emissions would also be reduced with the reduction in land uses in the Downtown, Mid-City, and Traffic Circle areas and the associated reduction of vehicle trips and lower energy demand. Overall, GHG emissions would be reduced for Alternative 2 compared to the proposed project, but would remain significant and adverse.

Land Use. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to land use and planning. 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, the proposed LUE and UDE included as part of this Alternative would also require the approval of a General Plan Update/Amendment, and future Local Coastal Plan Amendment and Rezone Amendment. Although the proposed project would require a General Plan Update/Amendment, Local Coastal Plan Amendment, and Rezone Amendment, similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2

would be consistent with the policies contained in the City's General Plan, and the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Specifically, Alternative 2 would be consistent with the RTP/SCS goal to encourage land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit and non-motorized travel. Therefore, impacts related to land use for Alternative 2 are considered to be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

Noise. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to noise. Construction activity associated with Alternative 2 would be incrementally less in the Downtown, Mid-City, and Traffic Circle areas, due to the reduction in land use intensities and potential amount of construction in these three areas, but would generally result in similar noise and vibration levels since the construction and excavation areas, methods, and equipment would be similar. Without mitigation, short-term construction noise generated during excavation, grading, and building construction would be potentially significant under both the proposed project and Alternative 2. With implementation of mitigation, both the proposed project and Alternative 2 would reduce potentially significant construction impacts to a less than significant level. Alternative 2 would result in fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project primarily due to the reduction in land use intensities in the Downtown, Mid-City, and Traffic Circle areas, and would, therefore, result in lower mobile-source noise levels in these areas. Because there would be incrementally less development constructed with this Alternative, overall impacts related to noise for Alternative 2 are considered to be slightly less than those associated with the proposed project.

Population and Housing. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have a less than significant impact on population and housing. Alternative 2 would reduce the square footage of potential development in the Downtown, Mid-City, and Traffic Circle areas as compared to the proposed project. This would result in less residential development and population growth. In addition, the commercial uses would be reduced under Alternative 2 and the employment opportunities associated with those uses would be eliminated. Because future housing and employment would be reduced under this alternative, the impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed project.

Public Services. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have a less than significant impact on public services. Public services include fire protection, police protection, public schools, and public libraries. Because the amount of development would be reduced for the PlaceType intensities in the Downtown, Mid City and Traffic Circle Areas under Alternative 2, the demands for public services would be reduced compared to the proposed project. Overall, impacts related to public services under Alternative 2 are considered incrementally less than under the proposed project.

Transportation/Traffic. Alternative 2 would generate fewer trips than the proposed project due to the reduction in land use intensities in the Downtown, Mid-City, and Traffic Circle Areas, but would not greatly reduce the number of intersections anticipated to operate in excess of the currently established level of service criteria. Alternative 2 would result in approximately 1,974,777 ADT trips, which would be 6,475 fewer total ADT trips compared to the proposed project (1,981,252 ADT trips). Compared to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact on

transportation/traffic at one fewer intersection (Pacific Avenue/Ocean Boulevard). Therefore, because there would still be significant and adverse impacts at 43 intersections, long-term operational traffic impacts would still be significant and adverse, similar to the proposed project. Furthermore, construction trips under Alternative 2 would also be incrementally reduced because there would be less construction equipment and fewer workers required for future projects in the Downtown, Mid-City, and Traffic Circle areas due to the reduction in intensity in these PlaceTypes. Therefore, impacts related to transportation/traffic under Alternative 2 are considered less than under the proposed project.

Utilities. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have a less than significant impact on utilities. Utilities include solid waste, public transportation, water, wastewater, electricity, and natural gas. Because the amount of development would be reduced for the PlaceType intensities in the Downtown, Mid City and Traffic Circle Areas under Alternative 2, the demands for utilities would be reduced compared to the proposed project. Overall, impacts related to utilities under Alternative 2 are considered incrementally less than under the proposed project.

5.6.3 Overview of Potential Impacts/Comparison to Proposed Project

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would result in significant unavoidable impacts related to air quality, GHG emissions, and transportation/traffic. Due to the reduction in intensity of land uses in the Downtown, Mid-City, and Traffic Circle areas under Alternative 2, overall impacts would be less than with the proposed project.

5.6.4 Attainment of Project Objectives

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would implement 14 new PlaceTypes and design standards included in the LUE and UDE. However, this alternative would not achieve certain project objectives to the same extent as the proposed project due to land use reductions in three areas.

Alternative 2 would promote livability, environmental quality, community health and safety, the quality of the built environment, and economic vitality (Objective 1) through implementation of the LUE and UDE. While Alternative 2 would include many of the features of the proposed project, this Alternative's consistency with the overall LUE goals (Objective 2), job growth (Objective 4), and land use changes that coincide with the regional economy (Objective 5) would be achieved at a lesser extent due to the reduction in land use intensities in the Downtown, Mid City, and Traffic Circle Areas. In addition, Alternative 2 would include PlaceTypes that encourage sustainable development practices comprised of placemaking principles and design standards to create walkable and complete neighborhoods (Objectives 3, 13, 14, 16, and 17). This Alternative would achieve many of the project objectives related to the provision of diverse housing types, as well as preserving existing neighborhoods (Objectives 6, 7, and 8). The Open Space PlaceType under Alternative 2 would ensure access to natural and urban open spaces, as well their maintenance, restoration, and preservation. (Objectives 11, 12, and 15). Similar to the proposed project, the 14 PlaceTypes would be distributed across the planning areas to ensure planning decisions are equitable and City investments are distributed in a manner to serve both new and existing developments in the City (Objectives 9 and

10). This Alternative would meet many of the project objectives but not to the same degree as the proposed project.

5.7 ALTERNATIVE 3: REDUCED VMT ALTERNATIVE/TRANSIT-ORIENTED ALTERNATIVE

5.7.1 Description

Alternative 3 would implement only the Low and Moderate Transit-Oriented Development PlaceTypes. This Alternative would recognize the objectives of Senate Bill 743 by reducing VMT per capita in order to improve the efficiency of the transportation network. Alternative 3 would be an amendment to the City's existing LUE and would be implemented as an Overlay Zone intended to focus development around existing and/or proposed transit to reduce the frequency and length of trips. Growth outside the proposed Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone would continue to be subject to the existing LUE. Alternative 3 would not include a new UDE, but rather would amend the SRE to include design guidelines within the Transit-Oriented PlaceType/Overlay Zone (including Low and Moderate areas). Therefore, this Alternative would eliminate the other 12 PlaceTypes proposed as part of the LUE. The Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone would occur in the same areas as the proposed project, along existing and/or planned transit corridors, in order to reduce the frequency and length of vehicle trips. The areas outside of the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone would be subject to the existing LUE. Alternative 3 would require a General Plan Update/Amendment and Rezone Amendment in order to ensure consistency with other policy documents. A Local Coastal Plan Amendment would not be required because the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone is not located within the Local Coastal Plan area. Table 5.C summarizes the uses assumed in the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone planning area under this Alternative. Planning areas outside the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone would be subject to the existing LUE and continue to grow as forecast and outlined in the General Plan. Only areas included in the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone are included in Table 5.C to show the buildout of the new PlaceType/Overlay Zone under Alternative 3 as compared to the proposed project.

5.7.2 Environmental Analysis

Aesthetics. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources, light, glare, and the existing visual character of the planning area and its surroundings. As previously stated, Alternative 3 would limit development to areas with existing and/or proposed transit, including the Metro Blue Line stations along the Long Beach Boulevard corridor and Pacific Avenue. Buildings proposed as part of Alternative 3 would be constructed at a heights similar to the proposed project in the Transit-Oriented Development- Low and Moderate PlaceTypes. Furthermore, this Alternative would, like the proposed project, be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code, which includes the lighting and landscaping standards. This Alternative would not include the remaining 12 PlaceTypes included in the proposed project, and the overall changes in visual character would be limited to specific areas in the City. Therefore, the overall visual impacts of Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less than those of the proposed project.

Table 5.C: Alternative 3: Square Footage General Plan Buildout

PlaceTypes	Residential Units			Non-Residential Building Square Footage				
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Total	Commercial	Office	Industrial	Public Facilities/ Institutional	Total
Transit-Oriented Development - Low	321	2,800	3,121	1,247,200	238,800	10,000	283,200	1,779,200
Transit-Oriented Development - Moderate	401	1,825	2,226	993,500	64,800	8,800	212,900	1,280,000
Proposed Project 2040 Total	64,598	110,940	175,538	24,484,100	8,977,500	25,240,600	24,435,800	83,138,000
Alternative 3 2040 Total	722	4,625	5,347	2,240,700	303,600	18,800	496,100	3,059,200
<i>Δ</i>	-63,876	-106,315	-170,191	-22,243,400	-8,673,900	-25,221,800	-23,939,700	-80,078,800

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

Air Quality. Construction and operational emissions associated with Alternative 3 would be reduced because this Alternative eliminates the remaining 12 PlaceTypes included in the proposed project. Air quality impacts would be substantially reduced during construction when compared to the project due to the reduced amount of building construction. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not exceed significance thresholds for criteria pollutants with the implementation of mitigation and standard SCAQMD measures. Because the scale of operational activities have not been determined or estimated as this is a programmatic level General Plan analysis, and in order to present conservative assumptions, the air quality impact associated with the future operation of individual projects that may occur with implementation of the proposed project are assumed to be potentially significant. Operational impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project with the reduced vehicle trips associated with focusing this PlaceType near transit. The transportation/traffic analysis for Alternative 3 includes consideration of the ambient growth that would occur outside the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone. Alternative 3 would also reduce significant adverse impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants because of the overall reduction in construction and operational emissions associated with new development under this Alternative. Overall, there would be substantially fewer air quality emissions for Alternative 3 as compared to the proposed project because there are 170,191 fewer residential units and 80,078,800 less sf of non-residential uses as compared to the proposed project at 2040 buildout. However, because future projects cannot be modeled at this time, operational impacts under Alternative 3 would still be considered potentially significant and adverse.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. While Alternative 3 would significantly reduce development as compared to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would result in significant impacts related to GHG emissions and global climate change as GHG emissions would exceed the Service Population threshold of 3.4 MT CO₂e per year by 2.1 MT CO₂e per year (for a total of 5.5 MT CO₂e per year). Under this Alternative and the proposed project, future development would be designed to meet and exceed all Title 24 standards, which would reduce energy consumption. Overall, GHG emissions would be substantially reduced during construction when compared to the proposed project due to the focus of development only around transit. Specifically, GHG emissions would be lower due to the reduced amount of building materials that would need to be produced and transported to the planning area to complete the construction. Operational emissions would also be reduced with the reduction in VMT and the associated reduction of vehicle trips and lower energy demand. Overall, GHG emissions would be reduced for Alternative 3 compared to the proposed project. Because future development would be limited to the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone, Alternative 3 would significantly reduce emissions as compared to the proposed project; however, impacts related to GHG emissions would continue to be significant and adverse under Alternative 3.

Land Use. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to land use and planning. Under this Alternative, as well as the proposed project, there would be no impacts related to the division of an existing community. The proposed Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone under Alternative 3 would be consistent with the existing surrounding land use pattern in the areas near existing and/or proposed transit. Similar to the proposed project, the proposed LUE and UDE included as part of this Alternative would also require the approval of a General Plan Update/Amendment and Rezone Amendment. A Local Coastal Plan

Amendment would only be required if the proposed Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone would occur within the coastal zone subject to that plan. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would be consistent with the policies contained in the City's General Plan, the SCAG RTP/SCS. Specifically, Alternative 3 would be consistent with the RTP/SCS goal to encourage land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit and non-motorized travel. In addition, this Alternative would recognize the objective of Senate Bill 743, by reducing VMT per capita. Therefore, impacts related to land use for Alternative 3 are considered to be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

Noise. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to noise. Construction activity associated with Alternative 3 would be incrementally less due to the focused areas of development, but would generally result in similar noise and vibration levels since the construction and excavation areas, methods, and equipment would be similar. Without mitigation, short-term construction noise generated during excavation, grading, and building construction would be potentially significant under both the proposed project and Alternative 3. With implementation of mitigation, both the proposed project and Alternative 3 would reduce potentially significant construction impacts to a less than significant level. Alternative 3 would result in fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project primarily due to less overall development and the focused development around transit, and would, therefore, result in lower mobile-source noise levels. Because there would be incrementally less development constructed with this Alternative, overall impacts related to noise for Alternative 3 are considered to be less than those associated with the proposed project.

Population and Housing. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have a less than significant impact on population and housing. Alternative 3 would reduce the number of residential units as compared to the proposed project. In addition, the commercial uses would be reduced under Alternative 3 and the employment opportunities associated with those uses would be eliminated. Development under this Alternative would be focused on existing and/or proposed transit areas. Therefore, the impacts under this Alternative related to population and housing would be less than those associated with the proposed project.

Public Services. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have a less than significant impact on public services. Public services include fire protection, police protection, public schools, and public libraries. Because the amount of development in the planning area would be reduced by limiting the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone to transit corridors, the demands for public services would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Overall, impacts related to public services under Alternative 3 are considered less than the proposed project.

Transportation/Traffic. Alternative 3 would generate fewer trips than the proposed project due to the implementation of only the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone. Alternative 3 would result in approximately 1,915,404 ADT trips, which would be 65,848 fewer total ADT trips compared to the proposed project (1,981,252 ADT trips). This reduction in ADT trips under Alternative 3 includes the ambient growth that would occur outside the Transit-Oriented

Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone. However, because traffic volume is anticipated to increase even under the No Project condition, Alternative 3 would not greatly reduce the number of intersections anticipated to operate in excess of the currently established level of service criteria. Compared to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact on transportation/traffic at eight fewer intersections (Paramount Boulevard/South Street, Magnolia Avenue/Ocean Boulevard, Pacific Avenue/Ocean Boulevard, Atlantic Avenue/7th Street, Orange Avenue/Wardlow Road, Lakewood Boulevard/Spring Street, Pacific Coast Highway/7th Street, and Bellflower Boulevard/7th Street). Therefore, because there would still be significant and adverse impacts at 36 intersections, long-term operational traffic impacts would still be significant and adverse, similar to the proposed project.

Furthermore, construction trips under Alternative 3 would also be substantially less because there would be less construction equipment and fewer workers required for projects because future development would occur only in the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone, and would not be distributed across the entire planning area. Therefore, while there could be significant impacts related to transportation/traffic under Alternative 3, overall impacts are considered to be slightly less than under the proposed project.

Utilities. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have a less than significant impact on utilities. Utilities include solid waste, public transportation, water, wastewater, electricity, and natural gas. Because the amount of development in the planning area would be reduced by limiting the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone to transit corridors, the demands for utilities would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Overall, impacts related to utilities under Alternative 3 are considered less than the proposed project.

5.7.3 Overview of Potential Impacts/Comparison to Proposed Project

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would result in significant unavoidable air quality, GHG emissions, and transportation/traffic impacts. However, because this Alternative only proposes the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone, development would be limited to specific transit corridors in the City, resulting in fewer significant adverse traffic impacts. Despite the substantially reduced scale of the project, Alternative 3 would continue to result in significant and adverse GHG emission impacts. The overall impacts for Alternative 3 would be less than with the proposed project due to the reduced amount of construction and development.

5.7.4 Attainment of Project Objectives

Alternative 3 would implement only one new PlaceType/Overlay Zone with two variations, the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType- Low and Moderate, in selected areas of the City. Because this alternative would not include the remaining 12 PlaceTypes included in the proposed project, this alternative would not achieve many of the project objectives.

This Alternative's promotion of livability, environmental quality, community health and safety, the quality of the built environment, and economic vitality (Objective 1) would be limited to the transit areas near this PlaceType.

Alternative 3 would not include the PlaceTypes that include many of the features of the proposed project, and therefore this Alternative's consistency with the overall LUE goals (Objective 2), job growth (Objective 4), and land use changes that coincide with the regional economy (Objective 5) would be achieved at a lesser extent than the proposed project. Due to the urbanized nature of the select areas subject to the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone, the restoration of natural reserves and the creation of "Great Places" would not be achieved under this Alternative (Objectives 12 and 13).

The Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone would directly encourage development near existing and/or proposed transit with the direct intent to create of compact development patterns and walkable neighborhoods, consistent with Objectives 3, 14, 16, and 17.

This Alternative would diversify housing options and provide both affordable and market-rate units in the City, but these improvements would be limited to areas near existing and/or proposed transit (Objectives 6 and 7). The Long Beach Boulevard corridor and associated Metro Blue Line stations are generally located in the central part of the City, and, therefore, only a limited portion of the City would be subject to this proposed PlaceType.

The Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone includes consideration of transitions between large and small scale developments to protect existing low-density neighborhoods (Objective 8). Parks are permitted within the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone and would integrate accessible open spaces into the urban environment (Objectives 11 and 15). This PlaceType would be generally distributed along the Long Beach Boulevard corridor and future planning decisions would be made transparently to ensure City investments are distributed in an equitable manner (Objectives 9 and 10). This Alternative would meet some, not all of the project objectives, and not to the same degree as the proposed project.

5.8 ALTERNATIVE 4: NEIGHBORHOOD-SERVING CENTERS AND CORRIDORS COMMERCIAL-ONLY ALTERNATIVE

5.8.1 Description

This Alternative assumes the planning area would be developed according to the same PlaceTypes included under the proposed project, but would prohibit residential uses in the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors – Moderate and Low PlaceTypes. Although this Alternative would result in reduced development in the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors – Moderate and Low PlaceType due to a removal of residential uses, the non-residential square footage would remain the same in this PlaceType. Residential uses would remain permitted in the Founding and Contemporary Neighborhoods, Multi-Family Residential-Low and Moderate, Transit-Oriented Development-Low and Moderate, Neo-Industrial, and Downtown PlaceTypes. Table 5.D summarizes the uses assumed in the planning area under this Alternative.

Table 5.D: Alternative 4: Square Footage General Plan Buildout

Place Types	Residential Units			Non-Residential Building Square Footage				
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Total	Commercial	Office	Industrial	Public Facilities/ Institutional	Total
Open Space	-	-	-	782,200	29,300	144,000	4,325,400	5,280,900
Neighborhood	59,898	50,936	110,834	5,388,800	902,900	407,100	11,158,100	17,856,900
Multi-Family – Low	719	7,099	7,818	60,300	2,800	-	99,200	162,300
Multi-Family – Moderate	856	12,449	13,305	-	-	-	-	-
Neighborhood Serving Centers and Corridors – Low	-	-	-	2,413,300	198,400	199,600	175,300	2,986,600
Neighborhood Serving Centers and Corridors – Moderate	-	-	-	2,435,700	290,100	368,900	120,000	3,214,700
Community Commercial	113	3,019	3,132	5,360,900	427,000	1,702,400	229,100	7,719,400
Transit-Oriented Development - Low	321	2,800	3,121	1,247,200	238,800	10,000	283,200	1,779,200
Transit-Oriented Development - Moderate	401	1,825	2,226	993,500	64,800	8,800	212,900	1,280,000
Neo-Industrial	54	1,406	1,460	364,700	14,200	1,575,200	17,700	1,971,800
Industrial	145	846	991	291,200	325,600	4,789,700	143,700	5,550,200
Downtown	530	12,055	12,585	2,439,400	4,564,400	89,100	729,000	7,821,900
Waterfront	7	3,126	3,133	2,125,200	898,000	-	605,700	3,628,900
Regional Serving Facility	6	1,104	1,110	581,700	1,021,200	15,945,800	6,336,500	23,885,200
Proposed Project 2040 Total	64,598	110,940	175,538	24,484,100	8,977,500	25,240,600	24,435,800	83,138,000
Alternative 4 2040 Total	63,050	96,665	159,715	24,484,100	8,977,500	25,240,600	24,435,800	83,138,000
Δ	-1,548	-14,275	-15,823	0	0	0	0	0

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

5.8.2 Environmental Analysis

Aesthetics. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would have less than significant impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources, light, glare, and the existing visual character of the planning area and its surroundings. As previously stated, Alternative 4 would include the same 14 PlaceTypes as the proposed project, but would eliminate the potential for residential uses in the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors- Low and Moderate PlaceTypes. The total number of residential units would be 15,823 less than the proposed project. Therefore, the overall visual changes would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. However, this Alternative would, like the proposed project, be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code, which includes the lighting and landscaping standards. Therefore, the overall visual impacts of Alternative 4 would be less than significant and similar to those of the proposed project.

Air Quality. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would have less than significant construction-related air quality impacts with mitigation incorporated. Construction and operational emissions associated with Alternative 4 would be incrementally reduced because this Alternative eliminates 2,939 daily vehicle trips associated with the removal of residential uses in the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors- Low and Moderate PlaceTypes. Air quality impacts during construction would be incrementally reduced when compared to the project due to less building construction, but could still exceed significance thresholds for criteria pollutants and would require implementation of mitigation and standard SCAQMD measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Alternative 4 would also reduce impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants because of the overall reduction in construction and operational emissions associated with new development under this Alternative, but impacts would remain significant and adverse even with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project with the reduction in vehicle trips in the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors- Low and Moderate PlaceTypes, resulting in 2,939 fewer total ADT as compared to the proposed project. Overall, there would be fewer air quality emissions for Alternative 4 compared to the proposed project, but long-term operational emissions would remain significant and adverse.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would have significant impacts related to GHG emissions and global climate change, as GHG emissions would exceed the Service Population threshold of 3.4 MT CO₂e per year by 2.5 MT CO₂e per year (for a total of 5.9 MT CO₂e per year). Similar to the proposed project, future developments under Alternative 4 would be designed to meet and exceed all Title 24 standards, which would reduce energy consumption. Overall, GHG emissions during construction would be incrementally reduced because fewer building materials would need to be produced and transported to the planning area to complete the construction. Operational emissions would also be reduced due to the reduction in the number of residential units and the reduction of vehicle trips (2,939 fewer total ADT) and lower energy demand associated with the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors- Low and Moderate PlaceTypes. Although GHG emissions would be reduced for Alternative 4 compared to the proposed project, GHG emissions would remain significant and adverse.

Land Use. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would have less than significant impacts related to land use and planning. Under this Alternative, as well as the proposed project, there would be no impacts related to the division of an existing community. The proposed PlaceTypes under Alternative 4 would be consistent with the existing surrounding land use pattern in the area. Similar to the proposed project, the proposed LUE and UDE included as part of this Alternative would also require the approval of a General Plan Update/Amendment, Local Coastal Plan Amendment, and Rezone Amendment. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would be consistent with the policies contained in the City's General Plan, the SCAG RTP/SCS. Therefore, impacts related to land use for Alternative 4 are considered to be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

Noise. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would have less than significant impacts related to noise. Construction activity associated with Alternative 4 would be incrementally reduced as compared to the proposed project due to the reduced amount of building square footage, but would generally result in similar noise and vibration levels since the construction and excavation areas, methods, and equipment would be similar. Without mitigation, short-term construction noise generated during excavation, grading, and building construction would be potentially significant under both the proposed project and Alternative 4. With implementation of mitigation, both the proposed project and Alternative 4 would reduce potentially significant construction impacts to a less than significant level. Alternative 4 would result in fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project primarily due to the elimination of residential uses in the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors- Low and Moderate PlaceTypes; and, therefore, result in lower mobile-source noise levels. Overall impacts related to noise for Alternative 4 are considered to be less than those associated with the proposed project.

Population and Housing. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would have a less than significant impact on population and housing. Alternative 4 would reduce the number of residential units by 15,823 as compared to the proposed project. The amount and square footage for commercial uses would remain the same under Alternative 4. Therefore, the employment opportunities associated with those uses would be similar to the proposed project. Therefore, the impacts under this Alternative related to population and housing would be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

Public Services. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would have a less than significant impact on public services. Public services include fire protection, police protection, public schools, and public libraries. Because the overall amount of development in the planning area would be reduced by 15,823 residential units in the proposed Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors- Low and Moderate PlaceTypes, the demands for public services would be less than for the proposed project. Overall, the demand for services and the impacts related to public services under Alternative 4 are considered to be less than the proposed project.

Transportation/Traffic. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would have significant and unavoidable impacts on transportation/traffic. Construction trips under Alternative 4 would be reduced as compared to the proposed project because there would be less construction equipment and

workers required for projects in the planning area. Additionally, Alternative 4 would generate fewer operational trips for the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors- Low and Moderate PlaceTypes than the proposed project due to the elimination of residential uses in these PlaceTypes. Alternative 4 would result in approximately 1,978,313 ADT trips, which would be 2,939 fewer total ADT trips compared to the proposed project (1,981,252 ADT trips). It is anticipated that this alternative would not result in fewer intersections experiencing a significant impact on transportation/traffic. Therefore, because there would still be significant and adverse impacts at 44 intersections, long-term operational traffic impacts would still be significant and adverse, similar to the proposed project

Therefore, impacts related to transportation/traffic under Alternative 4 are similar to the proposed project, and overall traffic impacts throughout the planning area would remain significant and unavoidable.

Utilities. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would have a less than significant impact on utilities. Utilities include solid waste, public transportation, water, wastewater, electricity, and natural gas. Because the overall amount of development in the planning area would be reduced by 15,823 residential units in the proposed Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors- Low and Moderate PlaceType, the demands for utilities would be less than for the proposed project. Overall, the demand for services and the impacts related to utilities under Alternative 4 are considered to be less than the proposed project.

5.8.3 Overview of Potential Impacts/Comparison to Proposed Project

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would result in significant unavoidable impacts related to air quality, GHG emissions, and traffic impacts. However, due to the elimination of residential uses from the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors PlaceType under Alternative 4, overall impacts to noise, public services, and utilities would be incrementally less than with the proposed project.

5.8.4 Attainment of Project Objectives

Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would include 14 PlaceTypes and design standards included in the LUE and UDE. However, because it would modify the allowed uses in one PlaceType, this alternative would achieve most of the Project objectives, but to a lesser extent than the proposed project.

Alternative 4 would include 14 PlaceTypes that and design standards to promote livability, environmental quality, community health and safety, the quality of the built environment, and economic vitality (Objective 1). While Alternative 4 would include many of the features of the proposed project, this Alternative's elimination of residential uses in the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors PlaceType would reduce the housing opportunities in the planning area and potential opportunities to offer mixed use housing within the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors PlaceType (Objectives 6 and 7).

While this Alternative would have reduced consistency with housing related objectives, when compared to the proposed project, Alternative 4 is consistent with a number of defined project

Objectives. Alternative 4 is consistent with eight Major Areas of Change (Objective 2), increased opportunities for job growth (Objective 4), and land use changes that coincide with the regional economy (Objective 5). In addition, Alternative 4 would include PlaceTypes that encourage sustainable development practices comprised of placemaking principles and design standards to create walkable and complete neighborhoods (Objectives 3, 13, 14, 16, and 17). This Alternative would not change the nature of housing opportunities in proposed low-density areas and/or existing neighborhoods (Objective 8). The Open Space PlaceType under Alternative 4 would ensure access to natural and urban open spaces, as well their maintenance, restoration, and preservation (Objectives 11, 12 and 15). Similar to the proposed project, the 14 PlaceTypes would be distributed across the planning areas to ensure planning decisions are equitable and City investments are distributed in a manner to serve both new and existing developments in the City (Objectives 9 and 10). This Alternative would meet many of the project objectives but not to the same degree as the proposed project.

5.9 IDENTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires the identification of an Environmentally Superior Alternative. *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.E provides, in summary format, a comparison of the level of impacts for each Alternative to the proposed project.

The No Project/No Build Alternative has the least impact to the environment because it would not introduce PlaceTypes or urban design standards with the potential to increase land use intensities and/or building heights in the City. While the No Project Alternative would lessen or avoid the impacts of the proposed project, the beneficial impacts of the proposed project—including the provision of a mix of land uses and policies for better placemaking not currently provided in the City’s General Plan—would not occur, and none of the project objectives would be met.

With the exception of the No Project Alternative, the Environmentally Superior Alternative would be Alternative 3: Reduced VMT Alternative/ Transit-Oriented Alternative. Overall, this Alternative would lessen significant environmental impacts more than the other alternatives, or result in impacts similar to those associated with the proposed project. Alternative 3 would achieve some of the project objectives—specifically it would directly encourage development near existing and/or proposed transit with the direct intent to create compact development patterns and walkable neighborhoods, consistent with Objectives 3, 14, 16, and 17. However, this Alternative would not increase livability, economic vitality or health throughout the planning area as it would be concentrated along Downtown transit corridors. Alternative 3 would not include the PlaceTypes that include many of the features of the proposed project, and therefore this Alternative’s consistency with the overall LUE goals (Objective 2), job growth (Objective 4), and land use changes that coincide with the regional economy (Objective 5) would not be achieved to the same degree as the proposed project. In addition, the reduction in air quality, greenhouse gas, noise, and traffic impacts would be minimal in comparison to the economic value of providing housing and employment opportunities throughout the City.

Table 5.E: 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 Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Areas of Change Reduction/ Reduced Project	Alternative 3: Reduced VMT Alternative/ Transit-Oriented Alternative	Alternative 4: Neighborhood -Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative
Aesthetics	Less Than Significant	L	L	L	L
Air Quality	Significant Unavoidable	L	L	L	L
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Significant Unavoidable	L	L	L	L
Land Use	Less Than Significant	L	S	S	S
Noise	Less Than Significant	L	L	L	L
Population and Housing	Less Than Significant	L	L	L	S
Public Services	Less Than Significant	L	L	L	L
Transportation/Traffic	Significant Unavoidable	L	L	L	S
Utilities	Less Than Significant	L	L	L	L
Attainment of project objectives	Meets all of the project objectives	Meets none of the project objectives	Meets a majority 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 a majority 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