



V. ALTERNATIVES

V. ALTERNATIVES

A. INTRODUCTION

1. INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of

¹ CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a).

² CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b).

³ CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f).

infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site . . .

Beyond these factors, CEQA Guidelines require the analysis of a “no project” alternative and an evaluation of alternative location(s) for the project, if feasible. Based on the alternatives analysis, an environmentally superior alternative is to be designated. If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, then the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.⁴ In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) requires that an EIR identify any alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and discuss the reasons for their rejection.

Of the various alternatives available for evaluation, the process of selecting project alternatives to be analyzed in this EIR included an identification of the significant effects associated with the Golden Shore Master Plan project, a review of the basic objectives established for the project (outlined in Section II, Project Description, and in subsection V.A.3, below), and consideration of the land use plans applicable to the proposed site. Based on these factors, the alternatives that were selected for analysis include:

- **No Project/No Development Alternative:** The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that the Golden Shore Master Plan project will not be developed and development of the Golden Shore Master Plan site with new uses and structures will not otherwise occur.
- **Reduced Intensity Alternative:** The Reduced Intensity Alternative was defined with reduced components of the proposed project’s key elements in order to address project impacts while simultaneously retaining sufficient development mix and intensity to accomplish most of the project’s basic objectives, though reduced to a degree. Thus, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in an overall 15-percent reduction in development intensity relative to the proposed, and therefore will include up to 1,165 residential units, 289,000 square feet of office uses, and 23,800 square feet of retail uses (relative to the proposed project’s Residential Option), or up to 942 residential units, approximately 311,000 square feet of office and retail uses, and 340 hotel rooms (relative to the proposed project’s Hotel Options).
- **West Site Only Alternative:** The West Site Only Alternative assumes that the site will be redeveloped with residential, office, and retail uses. This Alternative includes

⁴ CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2).

development proposed for the western portion of the project site under the proposed project's Residential and Hotel Options, but with no new development east of Golden Shore. As such, under this Alternative, 918 residential units, 260,000 square feet of office uses, and 20,000 square feet of retail uses (relative to the proposed project's Residential Option) or up to 574 residential units, 260,000 square feet of office uses, 400 hotel rooms, and 19,000 square feet of retail uses (relative to the proposed project's Hotel Options) will be developed on the western portion of the project site.

Each of these alternatives is described in more detail in Section V.B, below.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

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

- Create a world-class development project worthy of international recognition for its landmark design.
- Create a western icon for downtown Long Beach that will be recognizable from a great distance.
- Integrate into downtown a livable, walkable and diverse mixed-use development conveniently served by local and regional transit.
- Provided much needed first class hotel rooms to support the City's growing convention business.
- Increase high density housing to support a maturing employment hub.
- Create a secure, convenient urban neighborhood suited for living and working, with state-of-the-art amenities and public spaces.
- Create a corporate headquarters environment for two of the City's most prestigious businesses.

- Improve site access and provide sufficient parking for residents, visitors, patrons and employees.
- Create an environment to maximize local public transit throughout the downtown area.
- Incorporate sustainable design features to maximize energy and water use efficiency, reduce waste and pollutant generation, and minimize consumption of natural resources.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

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

- Alternative locations distant from the Golden Shore Master Plan site: As discussed in more detail below, the project site is available for development because the project proponents own the land on which the project is proposed. The project applicant has thus proposed the Golden Shore Master Plan project because the land is already in ownership and redevelopment of the site will enhance its value and achieve the other objectives expressed above. With this understanding, it is apparent that the applicant will not attempt to acquire another property on which to develop a project similar to that proposed on the project site. Developing a project like Golden Shore Master Plan on any available property is not an objective of the applicant, while developing Golden Shore Master Plan on the project site is, because it will enhance the value of an existing asset. Therefore, alternative locations not already owned by the project proponents cannot be reasonably considered, as their acquisition will be infeasible when considered relative to the project site.

4. ANALYSIS FORMAT

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

- a. The net environmental impacts of the alternative after implementation of reasonable mitigation measures are determined for each environmental issue area analyzed in the EIR.
- b. Post-mitigation significant and non-significant environmental impacts of the alternative and the project are compared for each environmental issue area. Where the net impact of the alternative will be clearly less adverse or more beneficial than the impact of the project, the comparative impact is said to be “less.” Where the alternative’s net impact will be clearly more adverse or less beneficial than the project, the comparative impact is said to be “greater.” Where the impacts of the alternative and the project will be roughly equivalent, the comparative impact is said to be “similar.”
- c. The comparative analysis of the impacts is followed by a general discussion of whether the underlying purpose and basic project objectives are substantially attained by the alternative.

Table V-1 on pages V-6 through V-10 provides a summary comparison of the impacts associated with each of the proposed alternatives with the impacts of the Golden Shore Master Plan project.

Table V-1
Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives
With Impacts of the Proposed Golden Shore Master Plan Project

Issue Area	Proposed Project Impact*	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2 Reduced Intensity Alternative*	Alternative 3 West Site Only Alternative*
Aesthetics				
Aesthetics/Visual Quality	Less than significant with mitigation	Greater	Greater	Greater
Views	Less than significant	Less	Less	Greater
Light/Glare	Less than significant with mitigation	Less	Less	Less
Shade/Shadow	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Air Quality				
Regional Construction Emissions	Significant and Unavoidable	Less	Less	Less
Local Construction Emissions	Significant and Unavoidable	Less	Less	Less
Construction Toxic Air Contaminants	Less Than Significant	Less	Less	Less
AQMP Consistency	Significant and Unavoidable	Less	Less	Less
Global Climate Change – Construction	Significant and Unavoidable	Less	Less	Less
Regional Operational Emissions	Significant and Unavoidable	Less	Less	Less
Local Operational Emissions	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Pedestrian Wind Effects	Less than significant with mitigation	Less	Similar	Similar

Table V-1 (Continued)

**Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives
With Impacts of the Proposed Golden Shore Master Plan Project**

Issue Area	Proposed Project Impact*	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2 Reduced Intensity Alternative*	Alternative 3 West Site Only Alternative*
Operational Toxic Air Contaminants	Less than significant with mitigation	Less	Less	Less
Global Climate Change – Operation	Significant and Unavoidable	Less	Less	Less
Cultural Resources				
Archaeological Resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Less	Similar	Less
Paleontological Resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Less	Similar	Less
Native American Resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Less	Similar	Less
Geology and Soils				
Seismic Ground Shaking	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Similar
Subsidence, Liquefaction, Collapse	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Similar
Soil Erosion/Loss of Topsoil	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Less
Hydrology and Water Quality				
Hydrology/Drainage	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Similar
Construction Surface Water Quality	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Less
Construction Groundwater Quality	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Less

Table V-1 (Continued)

**Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives
With Impacts of the Proposed Golden Shore Master Plan Project**

Issue Area	Proposed Project Impact*	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2 Reduced Intensity Alternative*	Alternative 3 West Site Only Alternative*
Operational Surface Water Quality	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Less
Operational Groundwater Quality	Less than significant	Less	Similar	Less
Land Use and Planning				
Land Use Compatibility	Less than significant	Similar	Greater	Similar
Regulatory Framework	Less than significant	Greater	Greater	Greater
Noise				
Construction Noise	Significant and Unavoidable	Less	Less	Less
Construction Vibration	Less Than Significant	Less	Similar	Less
Operational Stationary Source Noise	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
On-Site Operational Noise Effects	Less than significant with mitigation	Less	Less	Less
Off-Site Mobile Source Noise	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Operational Vibration	Less Than Significant	Less	Less	Less
Population and Housing				
Population	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Employment	Less than significant	Less	Greater	Greater
Housing	Less than significant	Less	Greater	Greater
Fire Protection				

Table V-1 (Continued)

**Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives
With Impacts of the Proposed Golden Shore Master Plan Project**

Issue Area	Proposed Project Impact*	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2 Reduced Intensity Alternative*	Alternative 3 West Site Only Alternative*
Services and Facilities	Less than significant with mitigation	Less	Less	Less
Emergency Response	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Emergency Access	Less than significant with mitigation	Less	Less	Less
Fire Flow	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Police Protection				
Services and Facilities	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Emergency Response	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Schools				
Services and Facilities	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Parks and Recreation				
Services and Facilities	Less than significant	Greater	Similar	Greater
Libraries				
Services and Facilities	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Traffic and Parking				
Intersections	Significant and Unavoidable	Less	Less	Less
Site Circulation and Emergency Access	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less

Table V-1 (Continued)

**Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives
With Impacts of the Proposed Golden Shore Master Plan Project**

Issue Area	Proposed Project Impact*	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2 Reduced Intensity Alternative*	Alternative 3 West Site Only Alternative*
CMP Freeways and Intersections	Significant and Unavoidable	Less	Less	Less
Transit	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Parking	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Water Supply				
Construction	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Operation	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
Solid Waste				
Construction	Less than significant with mitigation	Less	Less	Less
Operation	Less than significant with mitigation	Less	Less	Less

VI. ALTERNATIVES
B. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS
1. NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, “the no project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions . . . , as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.”⁵ The Guidelines continue to state that “in certain instances, the no project alternative means ‘no build’ wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained.”⁶

The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that the Golden Shore Master Plan project will not be developed and development of the Golden Shore Master Plan site with new uses and structures will not otherwise occur. The No Project/No Development Alternative will thus consist of the continued use of approximately 293,000 square feet of occupied office and retail floor area within Golden Shore Master Plan site.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

a. Aesthetics and Views

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the visual quality of the site would be maintained with three buildings ranging from two to 14 stories with varying architectural styles and no uniform design. The surface parking lots and parking structures would also remain without enhanced landscaping elements. As such, the project site would not be improved with a unified mixed-use development with enhanced architectural and landscaping elements and therefore impacts would be greater in this regard.

⁵ CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2).

⁶ CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B).

Since there would be no changes to the project site under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the existing viewshed of and from the project site would also be maintained. In addition, there would not be any glare impacts associated with construction activities or glare impacts to the motorists on Ocean Boulevard, Golden Shore, and Shoreline Drive and to the Hilton Hotel to the north and the Golden Shore RV Resort and Golden Shore Wildlife Preserve. Finally, by maintaining the existing buildings on-site, this Alternative would not result in any shade or shadow impacts to the surrounding uses, including the Hilton Hotel, Cesar E. Chavez Park, Santa Cruz Park, the Golden Shore RV Resort, and the Golden Shore Wildlife Preserve. As this Alternative would not cause any change in view blockage, lighting, or shading impacts, impacts would be less under the No Project/No Development Alternative compared to the proposed project.

b. Air Quality

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in changes to the existing air quality environment. Since no construction activities would occur on the site, this Alternative would not result in emissions associated with construction worker traffic, fugitive dust from demolition and excavation, or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Therefore, there would be no impact in regards to regional construction emissions, toxic air contaminants (TACs), or in regards to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during construction. While the Residential Option and Hotel Options would result in significant construction air quality impacts with regard to regional and localized impacts, Air Quality Management Plan Consistency, and GHG emissions, there would be no construction air quality impacts under this Alternative. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts in regards to air quality during construction.

With regard to operations, as the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in new development on the site, no new operational emissions related to the consumption of electricity and natural gas or vehicular traffic would occur. However, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not implement a number of land use policies that have direct and indirect positive air quality benefits by reducing vehicle trips through increasing the housing supply in close proximity to jobs, encouraging development that uses existing infrastructure, and/or locating a hotel near a major entertainment, retail, and business hub. Nonetheless, since no new emissions would result from this Alternative, impacts would be less than under the Residential Option or Hotel Options in regards to local and regional air emissions during operations. Similarly, since this Alternative would not result in any operational GHG impacts, opposed to a significant unavoidable impact under the proposed project, impacts would be less in this regard. Additionally, this Alternative would considerably reduce pedestrian wind effects relative to the proposed project, as impacts would be less than significant.

c. Cultural Resources

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not involve additional excavation and/or grading activities. Therefore, this Alternative would avoid the potential impacts related to the discovery of unknown paleontological, archaeological, or Native American resources. Accordingly, impacts to archaeological resources associated with this Alternative would be less than under the Residential Option and Hotel Options.

d. Geology and Soils

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in new development that would be subject to groundshaking as a result of seismic activity within the area. However, the existing buildings on-site are also subject to seismic groundshaking and could be subject to soil liquefaction, subsidence, and collapse. Regardless, the No Project/No Development would result in fewer impacts in relation to seismic activity.

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

e. Hydrology and Water Quality

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

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, there would be no new impact to water quality or groundwater during construction activities. It should be noted, however, that with development of the Residential Option or the Hotel Options impacts would be reduced to

less than significant given compliance with applicable water quality regulations. Regardless, since there would be no impact under this Alternative, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts to water quality and groundwater during construction. Similarly, while compliance with applicable water quality regulations would reduce impacts to water quality and groundwater during operations, there would be no impact under the No Project/No Development Alternative, resulting in fewer impacts compared to the project. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts to surface water quality, groundwater resources, and groundwater quality compared to the Residential Option and Hotel Options.

f. Land Use

The No Project/No Development Alternative would maintain the six-story City National Bank building, two-story Molina Health Care building, and the 14-story Union Bank of California building. In regards to compatibility of scale, the surrounding buildings include the 15-story Hilton Hotel and the 27-story One World Trade Center directly to the northwest across Ocean Boulevard, the twin 13-story Arco Center towers directly to the east, and the Chancellors six-story office building and RV Park to the south. As such, the existing Union Bank of California, City National Bank building, and the Molina Health Care building would be compatible with the cluster of varying height towers that surround the project site. In addition, maintaining the existing office, retail, and bank buildings on the project site would be consistent with the surrounding office and commercial uses. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be similar to the proposed project in its compatibility with the surrounding uses and compatibility of scale, resulting in similar impacts to the Residential Option and Hotel Options.

Since the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in the development of high-density residential uses near employment centers and large commercial areas, or provide development that would contribute to the City's art and culture, this Alternative would not be consistent with the growth management, economic development, downtown revitalization, new housing, and functional transportation elements of the City of Long Beach General Plan (General Plan). In addition, by maintaining the low-rise buildings on the western portion of the project site, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be inconsistent with the Urban Design Component of the Land Use Element, which focuses on developing high-rise buildings within the Downtown area to provide relief to the flat terrain and improve the viewshed along the major roadways. However, since it would maintain the existing uses on-site, this Alternative would be minimally consistent with the Land Use Plan designation of LUD No. 7 (Mixed-use District) that is classified as a multi-purpose activity center and the Downtown Regional Center Designation of Subarea "B," which allows visitor-serving, entertainment, open space, offices, and high-

density residential uses. Regardless, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in greater impacts regarding consistency with the General Plan.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would also be inconsistent with the land use objective of the Long Beach Local Coastal Program (LCP) since it would not contain high-density residential and high-intensity commercial uses within the Downtown Shoreline Planned Development (PD-6). And while this Alternative would be consistent with the parking requirements of the LCP, it would not include improvements and extension of the Santa Cruz Strip Park within the project site. Therefore, this Alternative would result in greater impacts in regards to consistency with the LCP.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would also be inconsistent with the Long Beach Strategic Plan 2010 and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Growth Vision Report since it would not include providing an aesthetically enhanced mixed-use development with high-density residential uses and an increase in office, retail, and/or hotel uses along major transportation corridors. Therefore, this Alternative would result in greater impacts regarding consistency with the Long Beach Strategic Plan 2010, SCAG's RTP and Growth Vision Report compared to the Residential Option and Hotel Options.

g. Noise

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not require construction activities that would impact nearby sensitive receptors. As such, this Alternative would not result in a significant and unavoidable construction noise impact to the Golden Shore RV Park and would not require mitigation measures to reduce the significant impact to the Hilton Hotel to a less than significant level. In addition, despite the fact that impacts regarding ground-borne vibration would be less than significant under the proposed project, this Alternative would result in no ground-borne vibration from construction activities. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in reduced noise impacts during construction.

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the existing three buildings that contain office and retail uses would continue to result in on-site operational noise including vehicle travel, mechanical equipment (e.g., HVAC systems), and landscape maintenance activities. It should be noted that while development of the Residential Option and Hotel Options would result in a greater density of development on the project site, the project would be required to comply with LBMC requirements ensuring that new on-site noise sources do not contribute to an increase in the ambient noise level. Regardless, since there would be a reduction of on-site operational equipment compared to the proposed project, stationary noise impacts would be less under this Alternative. Impacts related to on-site sensitive uses would not occur

under this Alternative, whereas mitigation measures are required to reduce such impacts to less than significant under the proposed project. As such, impacts would be less than the proposed project in this regard. Off-site mobile source noise and operational vibration impacts would be substantially reduced under this Alternative, though impacts would remain less than significant, as is the case with the proposed project.

h. Population, Employment, and Housing

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population in the Cities of Long Beach, the Gateway Cities subregion, or to the SCAG region. As such, this Alternative would not substantially alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of populations projected for the area. No new impacts would occur and population impacts would be less as compared with the proposed project.

Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would also not result in additional on-site employment. Existing employment levels associated with the office uses would remain unaffected. Therefore, implementation of this Alternative would not substantially alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of employment planned for the area by local and regional plans, resulting in fewer impacts as compared to the project. In addition, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in an increase in residential units but would also not result in a demand for housing, as there will be no increase in employment on the project site. Therefore, this Alternative would not substantially alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of housing planned for the area by local and regional plans, resulting in fewer impacts compared to the Residential Option and Hotel Options.

i. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, since there would be no construction, there would be no increase in demand for fire protection during construction, nor would there be any impacts to emergency access. In addition, there would not be an increase in residential, commercial, office, and/or hotel uses that would also require an increase demand for fire protection services. Emergency response and emergency access to the site would also be maintained, resulting in no impacts. Finally, the existing buildings already comply with fire flow requirements and would not require any new water supply or facilities to accommodate the increase fire flow. Therefore, since there would be no impacts to fire protection under the No Project/No Development Alternative, impacts would be less compared to the Residential Option and the Hotel Options.

(2) Police Protection

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not require construction activities and therefore, would not require additional police protection during construction or result in impacts to emergency access. Development of this Alternative would also not result in a direct and indirect population increase of 4,581 residents under the Residential Option and 4,190 residents under the Hotel Options. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities since it would not result in an increase of approximately 357 or 327 additional crimes, as would occur under the Residential Option and Hotel Options, respectively. Finally, this Alternative would not result in additional traffic, which could impact emergency response times. Therefore, since there would be no impacts under this Alternative, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities compared to the Residential Option or Hotel Options.

(3) Schools

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, there would be no increase in residential units and employment positions that would result in an increase of direct and indirect residents. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in an increase of 399 students or 329 students to the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD), as would occur under the Residential Option and Hotel Options, respectively. Thus, no impacts to schools would occur under the No Project/No Development Alternative and impacts would be less when compared with the proposed project.

(4) Parks and Recreation

Since new development would not occur and the on-site population would not change under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the existing demand for parks and recreational facilities would not be affected. Thus, implementation of this Alternative would not cause existing ratios of developed parklands per resident to decrease within Long Beach, nor would it affect any existing recreational facilities in the project vicinity. However, in contrast to the proposed project, new recreation and open space areas would not be introduced on the project site including 242,716 square feet of open space and recreational amenities under the Residential Option, 233,672 square feet of open space and recreational amenities under Hotel Option A, and 232,951 square feet of open space and recreational amenities under Hotel Option B. In addition, development of this Alternative would not include providing an 80-foot setback for all of the buildings along Ocean Boulevard, in order to provide the extension of Santa Cruz Park to the southern side of the roadway, in compliance with Ordinance C-7828 and would not provide additional funds in compliance with AB 1600, City requirements for park dedication and/or fees. Therefore, since this Alternative would not provide for an increase of parks and recreational

amenities compared to the Residential Option and the Hotel Options, this Alternative would result in greater impacts regarding parks and recreation.

(5) Libraries

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

j. Traffic and Parking

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, there would not be an increase in the amount of traffic on the regional and local roadways. As such, this Alternative would not result in significant unavoidable impacts to the surrounding intersections as would occur under the proposed project (which includes a Congestion Management Plan (CMP) intersection), and therefore impacts would be less than the proposed project in this regard.

By maintaining the existing conditions, this Alternative would not require mitigation measures in order to reduce impacts regarding site access to a less than significant level. Impacts regarding internal circulation and emergency access to the site would also be less than significant under this Alternative. However, it should be noted that impacts to these issue areas would also be less than significant under the proposed project only with the implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Despite the less than significant impacts to public transportation under the proposed project, development of the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in no impacts to these facilities. Finally, the No Project/No Development Alternative would also not require approval of a shared parking plan to ensure parking impacts remain below a level of significance, as the project site currently contains adequate parking facilities. As such, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts to traffic and parking.

k. Utilities and Service Systems

(1) Water Supply

The existing water consumption levels would not be affected by implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative since new development would not be constructed and the occupied on-site floor area would not increase beyond the existing conditions. Therefore, there would be no increase in demand for water during construction activities as would occur under the proposed project. However, it should be noted that impacts to water supply during construction activities would be less than significant. In addition, this Alternative would maintain the existing water demand of approximately 69,233 gallons per day (gpd) or 77.6 acre-feet per year (AFY) as opposed to a total demand of 380,184 gpd (425.9 AFY) under the Residential Option and a total water demand of 441,589 gpd (494.6 AFY) under the Hotel Options. Since there would be no new impacts to water supply under the No Project/No Development Alternative, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

(2) Solid Waste

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not require the demolition of the existing office buildings and construction of new high-rise buildings resulting in a total of 48,461 tons of solid waste under the Residential Option and 47,267 tons of solid waste under the Hotel Options, which would impact the County's unclassified landfills. However, it should be noted that impacts to the County's unclassified landfills would be less than significant with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. In addition, this Alternative would continue to generate approximately 1,723 pounds of solid waste per day as opposed to 7,660 pounds of solid waste per day under the Residential Option, or 7,550 pounds per day under the Hotel Options. Therefore, since this Alternative would not result in impacts to the County's unclassified landfills and would not result in a net increase of solid waste going to the County's Class III landfills, the No Project/No Development Alternative would have fewer impacts compared to the proposed project.

3. IMPACT SUMMARY

A comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with the No Project/No Development Alternative with the environmental impacts anticipated under the Golden Shore Master Plan project is provided in Table V-1 on pages V-6 through V-10. Although many of the improvements and project elements proposed as part of the Golden Shore Master Plan project would have beneficial effects, which would not occur under the No Project/No Development Alternative (refer to the discussion below), this Alternative would not result in new environmental impacts, with the exception of aesthetics (aesthetics/visual quality), land use and planning (regulatory framework), and parks and recreation. However, the significant impacts related to air quality (regional and local construction emissions, AQMP consistency, construction and operational GHG impacts, and regional operational emissions), noise (construction), and

traffic (intersections and CMP intersections) would be eliminated. This Alternative would also not require mitigation measures to reduce impacts regarding aesthetics/light and glare, pedestrian with effects, cultural resources, operational noise, fire protection, local intersections/site access, and solid waste) to a less than significant level. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in an overall reduced level of environmental impact as compared to the Golden Shore Master Plan project and all of the potentially significant impacts associated with the project would be avoided under this Alternative.

4. RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Since the No Project/No Development Alternative would maintain the existing conditions on the project site, it would not achieve any of the project objectives. Specifically, this Alternative would not fulfill the landmark design objective of creating a world-class development project worthy of international recognition. By maintaining the existing buildings on-site that do not have a cohesive design and represent older style office buildings, the No Project/No Development Alternative would also not assist the City in creating a western icon for downtown Long Beach that would be recognizable from a great distance. Finally, this Alternative would maintain the existing access that does not provide sufficient parking for residents, visitors, patrons, and employees.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would also not provide new development that would help to reduce vehicular travel and include sustainable design features to reduce environmental impacts. The existing development does not integrate a livable, walkable and diverse mixed-use development served by local and regional transit within the downtown area. In addition, the existing office and medical buildings do not create a secure, convenient urban neighborhood suited for living and working, with state-of-the-art amenities and public spaces. As such, this Alternative does not create an environment to maximize local public transit throughout the downtown area. Nor do the existing buildings incorporate sustainable design features to maximize energy and water use efficiency, reduce waste and pollutant generation, and minimize consumption of natural resources.

Finally, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not support the City's economic growth by providing much needed first class hotel rooms to support the City's growing convention business and development of corporate headquarters for two of the City's most prestigious businesses. This Alternative would also not provide an increase of high-density housing to support the City's maturing employment hub.

In summary, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not attain any of the basic objectives of the project and would not attain the Applicant's underlying purpose, which is to assist in the implementation of the City's long-range visions.

V. ALTERNATIVES
B. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS
2. REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE

Alternative 2 would be similar in type and location to the land uses associated with the proposed project's Hotel Option B, which is the most intensive project option in terms of traffic generation, but with an overall 15-percent reduction in development intensity. Development under this Alternative would occupy similar building footprints as the proposed project, but with incrementally reduced building heights for proposed structures. Accordingly, Alternative 2 would include up to 1,165 residential units, 289,000 square feet of office uses, and 23,800 square feet of retail uses (relative to the proposed project's Residential Option), or up to 942 residential units, approximately 311,000 square feet of office and retail uses, and 340 hotel rooms (relative to the proposed project's Hotel Options). Assuming a proportionate reduction in associated building heights, proposed structures under this Alternative would also be reduced by approximately 15 percent. All other related infrastructure improvements, landscaping, amenities, and project features would also be implemented, as appropriate.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

a. Aesthetics and Views

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a beneficial impact in regards to the aesthetic quality of the site by replacing older office buildings with architecturally enhanced residential and commercial mixed-use buildings. However, under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, the buildings would only reach a maximum height of approximately 390 feet (relative to the proposed project's Residential Option) or 420 feet (relative to the proposed project's Hotel Options), which would be inconsistent with the surrounding high-rise buildings, and would contrast with the surrounding aesthetic character of the area. As such, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in greater impacts in regards to visual quality since it would be inconsistent with the surrounding character of the area.

Nonetheless, under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, the building heights would be reduced by approximately 69 or 74 feet (relative to the proposed project's Residential Option and Hotel Options, respectively), which would provide for greater views through the project site

from surrounding uses. In addition, light and glare impacts would be incrementally reduced under the Reduced Intensity Alternative. Under the proposed project, impacts related to glare due to construction activities would be less than significant. In addition, similar to the project, impacts related to glare to the motorists on Ocean Boulevard, Golden Shore, and Shoreline Drive and to the Hilton Hotel to the north and the Golden Shore RV Resort and Golden Shore Wildlife Preserve would be less than significant with compliance with applicable LBMC requirements. Light and glare impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and would be less compared to the proposed project.

b. Air Quality

Since the Reduced Intensity Alternative would represent a 15-percent decrease in the amount of development proposed compared to the proposed project's development options, this Alternative would result in a corresponding reduction of construction emissions. As such, emissions associated with construction worker traffic, fugitive dust from demolition and excavation, or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment would all be reduced. In addition, impacts regarding regional and local construction emissions, TACs, and GHG emissions would also be incrementally reduced during construction. While the proposed project would result in significant regional and localized construction air quality impacts, GHG construction impacts, and AQMP consistency impacts, the reduced emissions under this Alternative would also reduce these air quality impacts, but not to less than significant. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in fewer impacts in regards to air quality during construction.

With regard to operations, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would also result in a corresponding reduction of operational emissions. This Alternative would also reduce impacts related to TACs and GHG emissions, and would result in similar impacts relative to pedestrian wind effects. The Reduced Intensity Alternative, like the proposed project, would also implement a number of land use policies that have direct and indirect positive air quality benefits by reducing vehicle trips through increasing the housing supply in close proximity to jobs, encouraging development that uses existing infrastructure, and/or locating a hotel near a major entertainment, retail, and business hub. Therefore, impacts would be less than under the proposed project's options in regards to local and regional air emissions, TACs, and GHG emissions during operations. Additionally, this Alternative would not notably reduce pedestrian wind effects relative to the proposed project, and impacts in this regard would be less than significant with mitigation.

c. Cultural Resources

Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would require excavation and/or grading activities. Therefore, this Alternative would similarly require

mitigation measures in order to ensure impacts related to the discovery of unknown paleontological, archaeological, or Native American resources would be less than significant. As such, impacts to cultural resources would be the same as those under the proposed project's various development options.

d. Geology and Soils

Development of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would also result in new development that would be subject to groundshaking as a result of seismic activity within the area. However, similar to the project, impacts related to seismic groundshaking would be less than significant with compliance with the LBMC building requirements. Similarly, in regards to soil liquefaction, subsidence, and collapse, the new buildings would have to comply with LBMC building requirements, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Finally, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would also result in excavation and grading activities that may result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, but compliance with applicable water quality regulations would serve to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts regarding geology and soils under this Alternative would be the same as those under the Residential or Hotel Options.

e. Hydrology and Water Quality

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would have the same building footprints as the Residential Option and the Hotel Options. Therefore, there would be the same amount of impervious surfaces increasing the amount of stormwater to the City and County storm drains serving the project site. Similar to the proposed project, existing stormwater facilities are adequate to accommodate development under this Alternative. In addition, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would include extensive landscaping throughout the development, which would serve to retain a portion of stormwater on-site that would otherwise be conveyed to local storm drains. Thus, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in similar impacts in regards to hydrology.

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, impacts regarding water quality or groundwater during construction activities would be similar to those under the Residential Option and Hotel Options. As such, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would also comply with applicable water quality regulations in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similarly, this Alternative would also comply with applicable water quality regulations to reduce impacts to water quality and groundwater during operations. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not result in significant impacts to surface water quality, groundwater resources, or groundwater quality, and impacts under this Alternative will be similar to the Residential Option or the Hotel Options.

f. Land Use

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would demolish the six-story City National Bank building, two-story Molina Health Care building, and the 14-story Union Bank of California building and replace them with buildings up to approximately 34 stories (relative to any of the proposed project development options). In regards to compatibility of scale, the surrounding buildings include the 15-story Hilton Hotel and the 27-story One World Trade Center directly to the northwest across Ocean Boulevard, and the twin, 13-story Arco Center towers directly to the east. As such, the proposed buildings under this Alternative would contrast with the cluster of varying height towers that create a defining edge to Long Beach's downtown high-rise strip. However, similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would be consistent with the surrounding office and commercial uses. Therefore, while the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be similar to the proposed project in its compatibility with the surrounding uses, it would not be consistent in regards to compatibility of scale, resulting in greater impacts than the Residential Option and Hotel Options in this regard.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would also result in the development of high-density residential uses near employment centers and large commercial areas, and provide development that would contribute to the City's art and culture. As such, this Alternative would be consistent with the growth management, economic development, downtown revitalization, new housing, and functional transportation elements of the General Plan. Similarly, this Alternative would be consistent with the Land Use Plan designation of LUD No. 7 (Mixed-use District), which is classified as a multi-purpose activity center and the Downtown Regional Center Designation of Subarea "B," which allows visitor-serving, entertainment, open space, offices, and high-density residential uses. However, since the buildings under this Alternative would not be the same height of high-rise buildings as compared to the Residential Option and the Hotel Options, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be inconsistent with the Urban Design Component of the Land Use Element, which focuses on developing high-rise buildings within the Downtown area to provide relief to the flat terrain and improve the viewshed along the major roadways. Thus, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in greater impacts regarding consistency with the General Plan.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would also be consistent with the land use objective of the LCP since it would contain high-density residential and high-intensity commercial uses within the Downtown Shoreline Planned Development (PD-6). And this Alternative would be consistent with the parking requirements of the LCP and the park dedication of the Santa Cruz Strip Park. Therefore, this Alternative would result in similar impacts in regards to consistency with the LCP.

Finally, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would also be consistent with the Long Beach Strategic Plan 2010 and the SCAG RTP and Growth Vision Report since it would include providing an aesthetically enhanced mixed-use development with high-density residential uses and an increase in office, retail, and/or hotel uses along major transportation corridors. Therefore, this Alternative would result in similar impacts regarding consistency with the Long Beach Strategic Plan 2010, SCAG's RTP and Growth Vision Report compared to the Residential Option and Hotel Options.

g. Noise

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would require construction activities that would impact nearby sensitive receptors. As such, this Alternative would also result in a significant and unavoidable construction noise impact to the Golden Shore RV Park use (R2) and would require mitigation measures to reduce the significant impact to the Hotel use (R6) to a less than significant level, as is the case with the proposed project's various development options. In addition, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to groundborne vibration, similar to the proposed project. Regardless, since this Alternative would require a shorter construction time period, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in fewer noise impacts during construction.

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, the operation of proposed uses would be similar to under the proposed project conditions, yet would be incrementally reduced in terms of overall intensity. It should be noted that while development of the Residential Option and Hotel Options would result in a greater density of development on the project site, the project would be required to comply with LBMC requirements ensuring that new on-site noise sources do not contribute to an increase in the ambient noise level. Regardless, since there would be a reduction of on-site operational equipment compared to the proposed project, stationary noise impacts would be less under this Alternative. Impacts related to on-site sensitive uses would also occur under this Alternative, like the proposed project, and therefore mitigation measures would be required to reduce such impacts to less than significant. However, impacts would be incrementally less than the proposed project in this regard. Off-site mobile source noise and operational vibration impacts would be proportionally reduced under this Alternative, though impacts would remain less than significant, as is the case with the proposed project.

h. Population, Employment, and Housing

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would also result in a direct or indirect increase in population in the Cities of Long Beach, the Gateway Cities subregion, or to the SCAG region. However, development of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a direct population increase of 3,377 persons and an indirect population increase of 517, compared to the Residential

Option's 3,973 direct population increase and 608 indirect population increase; or a direct population increase of 2,736 persons and an indirect population increase of 825, compared to the Hotel Options' direct population increase of 3,219 persons and indirect population increase of 971 persons. Therefore, this Alternative would result in fewer population impacts compared to the Residential Option and the Hotel Options.

Implementation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would also result in additional on-site employment. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in 712 new employment positions compared to 838 under the Residential Option, or 1,138 positions compared to 1,339 under the Hotel Options. Therefore, this Alternative would not result in the same increase in employment positions compared to the proposed project, resulting in greater impacts in this regard. Implementation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would also only result in development of 1,165 new residential units compared to 1,370 under the Residential Option, or 944 new residential units compared with 1,110 under the Hotel Options. As such, impacts regarding housing would also be greater under this Alternative.

i. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, the demand for fire protection during construction and any impacts to emergency access would be reduced since the construction time period would be shorter compared to the proposed project. In addition, there would be a decrease in demand for fire protection services due to the decrease in the residential, commercial, office, and/or hotel uses that would be developed under this Alternative compared to the proposed project. Finally, similar to the proposed project, the buildings would be required to comply with fire flow requirements but would have a reduced impact to water supply or facilities to accommodate the fire flow. Therefore, impacts under this Alternative would be less compared to the Residential Option and the Hotel Options.

(2) Police Protection

Impacts regarding police protection and emergency access would also be reduced during construction due to the reduced construction time period under this Alternative. In addition, as described above, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would only result in a total population increase of 3,894 compared to 4,581 residents under the Residential Option, or 3,562 compared to 4,190 residents under the Hotel Options. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities since it would only result in an increase of approximately 304 crimes per year compared to the 357 under the Residential Option, or 278 crimes per year compared to the 327 additional crimes under the Hotel Options. Finally, this

Alternative would result in a reduction of traffic compared to the proposed project, which could impact emergency response times. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities compared to the Residential Option or Hotel Options.

(3) Schools

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, compared to existing conditions, the 1,165-unit increase in residential units and increase of 712 employment positions (relative to the Residential Option), or 1,138-unit residential increase and increase of 944 employment positions (relative to the Hotel Options), would result in a direct and indirect increase in City residents. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in an increase of 339 students to the LBUSD compared to 399 students under the Residential Option, or 280 students compared to 329 students under the Hotel Options. Thus, impacts to the LBUSD would be less when compared with the proposed project.

(4) Parks and Recreation

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would include the same recreational amenities as those included in the Residential Option and Hotel Options. Specifically, this Alternative would include 242,716 square feet of open space and recreational amenities including landscaping and recreational areas on the roof (deck) of the podium parking structures. The roof deck recreational facilities would include a 5,132-square-foot clubhouse (including a 592-square-foot lobby) and other residential amenities, such as a swimming pool and landscaped deck. In addition, development of this Alternative would also include providing an 80-foot setback for all of the buildings along Ocean Boulevard, in order to provide the extension of Santa Cruz Park to the southern side of the roadway, in compliance with Ordinance C-7828 and would provide additional funds in compliance with AB 1600, City requirements for park dedication and/or fees. Therefore, this Alternative would result in similar impacts regarding parks and recreation compared to the proposed project.

(5) Libraries

As described above, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a direct or indirect increase in population of a total of 3,894 persons relative to the Residential Option, or 3,561 persons relative to the Hotel Options. Therefore, this Alternative would require an increase of library items and library square footage to maintain the existing services and facilities per capita. However, since the total population impacting the library services and facilities would be reduced compared to the Residential Option and the Hotel Options, impacts would be less than

significant. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to library services and facilities compared to the Residential and Hotel Options.

j. Traffic and Parking

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in an incremental decrease in the amount of traffic impacting the regional and local roadways. The overall 15-percent reduction in land use intensity under this Alternative results in a proportionate reduction in impacts to local and regional intersections, such that mitigation is not required at affected locations, whereas improvements would be required under the proposed project's various development options. As such, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts to study area intersections (including CMP intersections). However, despite the incremental reduction in the traffic, this Alternative would still require mitigation (installing a traffic light at Driveway A off of Golden Shore) in order to reduce impacts regarding site access to a less than significant level, and therefore impacts regarding internal circulation and emergency access to the site would be similar to the proposed project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would also result in a decrease ridership of public transportation and would not require approval of a shared parking plan to ensure parking impacts remain below a level of significance, as podium parking structures would be constructed with similar parking capacity as under the proposed project. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in fewer impacts to traffic and parking.

k. Utilities and Service Systems

(1) Water Supply

Development of the Reduced Density Alternative would result in construction of 1,165 residential units and approximately 312,800 square feet of commercial uses relative to the Residential Option, or 944 residential units, 400 hotel rooms, and approximately 312,000 square feet of commercial uses relative to the Hotel Options, which would require less water due to the decrease amount of construction activities required compared the project. As such, this Alternative would also require water during construction activities. However, similar to the proposed project, impacts to water supply during construction activities would be less than significant. In addition, this Alternative would result in a total water demand of approximately 323,156 gpd (362.0.1 AFY) as opposed to a total demand of 380,184 gpd (425.9 AFY) under the Residential Option, or approximately 375,350 gpd (420.4 AFY) as opposed to 441,589 gpd (494.6 AFY) under the Hotel Options. Therefore, there would be fewer impacts to water supply under the Reduced Intensity Alternative compared to the proposed project.

(2) Solid Waste

Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would require the demolition of the existing office buildings and construction of new high-rise buildings resulting in a total of 41,192 tons of solid waste relative to the Residential Option, or 40,177 tons of solid waste relative to the Hotel Options. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a reduction of approximately 7,269 tons of construction solid waste compared to the Residential Option and 7,090 tons of solid waste compared to the Hotel Options. However, it should be noted that impacts to the County's unclassified landfills would be less than significant with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. In addition, this Alternative would generate approximately 6,511 pounds of solid waste per day as opposed to 7,660 pounds of solid waste per day under the Residential Option, or approximately 6,418 pounds of solid waste per day as opposed to 7,550 pounds per day under the Hotel Options. Therefore, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to the County's unclassified landfills and to the County's Class III landfills compared to the proposed project.

3. IMPACT SUMMARY

A comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with the Reduced Intensity Alternative with the environmental impacts anticipated under the Golden Shore Master Plan project is provided in Table V-1 on pages V-6 through V-10. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in less impacts to aesthetics (views, light/glare, shade/shadow), air quality (construction and operational emissions), noise (construction and operation), population, fire protection, police protection, schools, libraries, traffic and parking, water supply, and solid waste. In addition, this Alternative would reduce the significant air quality and noise impacts during construction, and the significant traffic impacts to intersections; however, construction air quality and noise impacts would remain significant under this Alternative, but the significant traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant. It should also be noted that impacts would be similar to the proposed project regarding pedestrian wind effects, cultural resources (which would still require mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level), geology and soils, hydrology and drainage, construction period vibration, and parks and recreation. However, this Alternative would result in greater impacts in regards to aesthetics/visual quality, land use and planning (land use compatibility and regulatory framework), and employment and housing.

4. RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, some of the project design objectives would be fulfilled. This Alternative would create a world-class development project worthy of international recognition and would provide sufficient parking for residents, visitors, patrons, and

employees. However, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not create a western icon for downtown Long Beach that would be recognizable from a great distance.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would provide new development that would help to reduce vehicular travel and include sustainable design features to reduce environmental impacts. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would also integrate a livable, walkable and diverse mixed-use development served by local and regional transit within the downtown area. In addition, this Alternative would create a secure, convenient urban neighborhood suited for living and working, with state-of-the-art amenities and public spaces. This Alternative would create an environment to maximize local public transit throughout the downtown area and would incorporate sustainable design features to maximize energy and water use efficiency, reduce waste and pollutant generation, and minimize consumption of natural resources.

However, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not support the City's economic growth by providing much needed first class hotel rooms to support the City's growing convention business but it would include development of corporate headquarters for two of the City's most prestigious businesses. In addition, this Alternative would provide an increase of high-density housing to support the City's maturing employment hub.

Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would fulfill some of the design and economic objectives and all of the development objectives.

V. ALTERNATIVES
B. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS
3. WEST SITE ONLY ALTERNATIVE

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE

Under this Alternative, only the western portion of the project site would be developed with land uses included under the proposed project's Residential Option. As such, the eastern portion of the project site would remain in its current state with no development occurring in Parcel 3, and the western portion of the site would be developed with 918 residential units, 260,000 square feet of office uses, and 20,000 square feet of retail uses (relative to the proposed project's Residential Option) or up to 574 residential units, 260,000 square feet of office uses, 400 hotel rooms, and 19,000 square feet of retail uses (relative to the proposed project's Hotel Options). All other related infrastructure improvements, landscaping, amenities, and other project features would be implemented, as appropriate, within the western portion of the project site.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

a. Aesthetics and Views

The West Site Only Alternative would result in the demolition of the six-story City National Bank and the two-story Molina Health Care buildings on Parcels 1 and 2 and redevelop the site with three high-rise towers that would include a total of 918 residential units, 260,000 square feet of office uses, and 20,000 square feet of retail uses (relative to the proposed project's Residential Option) or up to 574 residential units, 260,000 square feet of office uses, 400 hotel rooms, and 19,000 square feet of retail uses (relative to the proposed project's Hotel Options). This Alternative would also include all of the landscaping and pedestrian amenities proposed for the western portion of the project site under the various project options, including embedded retail and townhomes within the podium level. However, the West Site Only Alternative would not include demolition of the 14-story Union Bank of California building. Therefore, aesthetic impacts during construction activities would be less under the West Site Only Alternative than compared to the Residential Option and Hotel Options.

The West Site Only Alternative would result in a beneficial impact in regards to the aesthetic quality of the western portion of the project site with architecturally enhanced mixed-

use buildings with extensive landscaping and pedestrian amenities. In addition, development of this Alternative would be consistent with the character and scale of the area, which includes high-rise residential and office buildings within the immediate vicinity. However, this Alternative would not redevelop the eastern portion of the project site and would maintain the existing 14-story Union Bank of California building. As such, the West Site Only Alternative would result in greater impacts in regards to visual quality since it would not include redevelopment of the eastern portion of the project site.

The West Site Only Alternative would have similar impacts to views as the proposed project's various options. However, the viewshed of the eastern portion of the project site would not be improved with a high-rise development and instead, the older Union Bank of California building would be maintained. Therefore, the West Site Only Alternative would result in greater impacts in regards to views.

In regards to light and glare impacts, the West Site Only Alternative would result in fewer impacts compared to the project since no new development would occur on the eastern portion of the project site. In addition, similar to the project, impacts related to glare to the motorists on Ocean Boulevard, Golden Shore, and Shoreline Drive and to the Hilton Hotel to the north and the Golden Shore RV Resort and Golden Shore Wildlife Preserve to the south would be less than significant with compliance with the LBMC requirements. Therefore, despite the less than significant light and glare impacts assumed under the Residential Option and Hotel Options, impacts under this Alternative would be less than the proposed project.

Finally, shade and shadow impacts would also be reduced with development of the West Site Only Alternative since the 34-story mixed-use high rise would not be developed on the eastern portion of the project site. Therefore, this Alternative would not result in shade and shadow impacts to the Hilton Hotel, across the street. Similarly, even though shade and shadow impacts would be less than significant under the Residential Option and the Hotel Options, the West Site Only Alternative would have fewer impacts in this regard.

b. Air Quality

Since the West Site Only Alternative would only develop the western portion of the project site, and therefore would result in a substantial reduction in overall development intensity compared to the proposed project's development options, this Alternative would result in a corresponding reduction of construction emissions. As such, emissions associated with construction worker traffic, fugitive dust from demolition and excavation, or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment would all be reduced. In addition, impacts regarding regional and local construction emissions, TACs, and GHG emissions would also be reduced due to a shorter construction period. While the proposed project would result in significant regional and

localized construction air quality impacts, GHG construction impacts, and AQMP consistency impacts, the reduced emissions under this Alternative would also reduce these air quality impacts, but not to less than significant. Therefore, the West Site Only Alternative would result in fewer impacts in regards to air quality during construction.

With regard to operations, the West Site Only Alternative would also result in a corresponding reduction of operational emissions. This Alternative would also reduce impacts related to TACs and GHG emissions, and would result in similar impacts relative to pedestrian wind effects. The West Site Only Alternative, like the proposed project, would also implement a number of land use policies that have direct and indirect positive air quality benefits by reducing vehicle trips through increasing the housing supply in close proximity to jobs, encouraging development that uses existing infrastructure, and/or locating a hotel near a major entertainment, retail, and business hub. Therefore, impacts would be less than under the proposed project's options in regards to local and regional air emissions, TACs, and GHG emissions during operations. Additionally, this Alternative would not notably reduce pedestrian wind effects relative to the proposed project, and impacts in this regard would be less than significant with mitigation.

c. Cultural Resources

Since the West Site Only Alternative would only require excavation and/or grading activities on the western portion of the project site, no grading or excavation would be required for the eastern portion of the project site. Therefore, even though this Alternative would also require mitigation measures in order to ensure impacts related to the discovery of unknown paleontological, archaeological, or Native American resources would be less than significant, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to cultural resources compared to the Residential Option and Hotel Options.

d. Geology and Soils

Development of the West Site Only Alternative would also result in new development that would be subject to groundshaking as a result of seismic activity within the area. Similarly, in regards to soil liquefaction, subsidence, and collapse, the new buildings would have to comply with LBMC building requirements, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. As such, similar to the Residential Option and Hotel Options, compliance with building code regulations would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Finally, the West Site Only Alternative would also result in excavation and grading activities that may result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, but compliance with applicable water quality regulations would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. However,

since the eastern portion of the project site would not be graded, there would be less of a chance of impacts related to soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Therefore, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts compared to the Residential or Hotel Options.

e. Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the West Site Only Alternative, the amount of impervious surfaces would be the same on the eastern portion of the project site and the development of the western portion of the project site would increase. However, similar to the proposed project, existing stormwater facilities are adequate to accommodate development under this Alternative. In addition, the West Site Only Alternative would include extensive landscaping throughout the development, which would serve to retain a portion of stormwater on-site that would otherwise be conveyed to local storm drains. Thus, the West Site Only Alternative would result in similar impacts in regards to hydrology.

Under the West Site Only Alternative, impacts regarding water quality or groundwater during construction activities would be reduced compared to those under the Residential Option and Hotel Options. Regardless, the West Site Only Alternative would also comply with applicable water quality regulations in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Similarly, this Alternative would also comply with applicable water quality regulations to reduce impacts to water quality and groundwater during operations. Therefore, the West Site Only Alternative would not result in significant impacts to surface water quality, groundwater resources, or groundwater quality, and impacts under this Alternative would be reduced compared to the Residential Option or the Hotel Options.

f. Land Use

The West Site Only Alternative would demolish the six-story City National Bank building and the two-story Molina Health Care building on Parcels 1 and 2 and redevelop the site with three high-rise towers that would include a total of 918 residential units, 260,000 square feet of office uses, and 20,000 square feet of retail uses (relative to the proposed project's Residential Option), or up to 574 residential units, 260,000 square feet of office uses, 400 hotel rooms, and 19,000 square feet of retail uses (relative to the proposed project's Hotel Options). However, under this Alternative the 14-story Union Bank of California building would be maintained. In regards to compatibility of scale, the western portion of the project site would be consistent with the surrounding buildings including the 15-story Hilton Hotel, the 27-story One World Trade Center directly to the northwest across Ocean Boulevard, and the twin, 13-story Arco Center towers directly to the east. In addition, the eastern portion of the project site would also include the 14-story Union Bank of California building, which would be compatible with the surrounding high-rise office and residential buildings. Therefore, the West Site Only Alternative

would be similar to the proposed project in its compatibility with the surrounding uses and compatibility of scale.

The West Site Only Alternative would also result in the development of high-density residential uses near employment centers and large commercial areas, and provide development that would contribute to the City's art and culture. As such, this Alternative would be consistent with the growth management, economic development, downtown revitalization, new housing, and functional transportation elements of the General Plan. Similarly, this Alternative would be consistent with the Land Use Plan designation of LUD No. 7 (Mixed-use District), which is classified as a multi-purpose activity center and the Downtown Regional Center Designation of Subarea "B," which allows visitor-serving, entertainment, open space, offices, and high-density residential uses. In addition, the West Site Only Alternative would be consistent with the Urban Design Component of the Land Use Element, which focuses on developing high-rise buildings within the Downtown area to provide relief to the flat terrain and improve the viewshed along the major roadways. Thus, the West Site Only Alternative would result in similar impacts regarding consistency with the General Plan.

The West Site Only Alternative would also be consistent with the land use objective of the LCP since it would contain high-density residential and high-intensity commercial uses within the Downtown Shoreline Planned Development (PD-6). However, under the West Site Only Alternative, the Santa Cruz Park dedication would not occur and therefore, would result in greater impacts in regards to consistency with the LCP.

Finally, the West Site Only Alternative would be consistent with the Long Beach Strategic Plan 2010 and the SCAG RTP and Growth Vision Report since it would include providing an aesthetically enhanced mixed-use development with high-density residential uses and an increase in office, retail, and/or hotel uses along major transportation corridors. Therefore, this Alternative would result in similar impacts regarding consistency with the Long Beach Strategic Plan 2010, SCAG's RTP and Growth Vision Report compared to the Residential Option and Hotel Options.

g. Noise

The West Site Only Alternative would also require construction activities that would impact nearby sensitive receptors. As such, this Alternative would continue to result in a significant and unavoidable construction noise impact to the Golden Shore RV Park and would require mitigation measures to reduce the significant impact to the Hilton Hotel to a less than significant level. In addition, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts regarding ground-borne vibration, similar to the proposed project, but would be incrementally reduced due to the shorter duration of construction activities. As such, since this Alternative

would not include construction on the eastern portion of the project site, the West Site Only Alternative would result in fewer noise impacts during construction.

Under the West Site Only Alternative, the operation of proposed uses in the western portion of the site would be similar to under the proposed project conditions, but the project would be incrementally reduced in terms of overall intensity. It should be noted that while development of the Residential Option and Hotel Options would result in an overall increase in density of development on the project site, the project would be required to comply with LBMC requirements ensuring that new on-site noise sources do not contribute to an increase in the ambient noise level. Regardless, since there would be a reduction of on-site operational equipment compared to the proposed project, stationary noise impacts would be less under this Alternative. Impacts related to on-site sensitive uses would also occur under this Alternative, like the proposed project, and therefore mitigation measures would be required to reduce such impacts to less than significant. However, impacts would be incrementally less than the proposed project in this regard. Off-site mobile source noise and operational vibration impacts would be proportionally reduced under this Alternative, and impacts would remain less than significant, as is the case with the proposed project.

h. Population and Housing

The West Site Only Alternative would result in a direct or indirect increase in population in the Cities of Long Beach, the Gateway Cities subregion, or to the SCAG region. However, development of the West Site Only Alternative would result in a direct population increase of 2,662 persons and an indirect population increase of 462 compared to the Residential Option of 3,973 direct population increase and 608 indirect population increase, or a direct population increase of 1,665 persons and an indirect population increase of 779 compared to the Hotel Options' direct population increase of 3,219 persons and indirect population increase of 971 persons.⁷ Therefore, this Alternative would result in fewer population impacts compared to the Residential Option and the Hotel Options.

Implementation of the West Site Only Alternative would also result in additional on-site employment. The West Site Only Alternative would result in a total of 637 new employment positions compared to 838 under the Residential Option, or a total of 1,075 new employment

⁷ *The direct population was calculated assuming 2.9 persons per household. The indirect population was calculated assuming one-quarter of the employees would relocate to the area and based upon a household size of 2.9 persons.*

positions compared to 1,339 under the Hotel Options.⁸ Thus, impacts relative to employment would be greater than those under the Residential Option and the Hotel Options.

Implementation of the West Site Only Alternative would also result in development of only 918 residential units compared to the 1,370 under the Residential Option, or 574 residential units compared to 1,110 under the Hotel Options. Therefore, this Alternative would similarly result in greater impacts to housing compared to the proposed project.

i. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection

Under the West Site Only Alternative, the demand for fire protection during construction and any impacts to emergency access would be reduced since construction would only occur on the western portion of the project site. In addition, there would be a decrease in demand for fire protection services due to the decrease in the residential, commercial, and office uses that would be developed under this Alternative compared to the proposed project. Finally, similar to the proposed project, the buildings would be required to comply with fire flow requirements but would have a reduced impact to water supply or facilities to accommodate the fire flow. Therefore, impacts under this Alternative would be less compared to the Residential Option and the Hotel Options.

(2) Police Protection

Impacts regarding police protection and emergency access would also be reduced during construction due to the reduced construction time period under this Alternative. In addition, as described above, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would only result in a total population increase of 3,124 compared to 4,581 residents under the Residential Option, or 2,444 compared to 4,190 residents under the Hotel Options. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities since it would only result in an increase of approximately 244 crimes per year compared to the 357 under the Residential Option, or 191 crimes per year compared to the 327 additional crimes under the Hotel Options. Finally, this Alternative would result in a reduction of traffic compared to the proposed project, which could impact emergency response times. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in

⁸ *The employment calculations assumed 2.36 employees per 1,000 square feet of retail uses and 2.27 employees per 1,000 square feet of office area.*

fewer impacts to police protection services and facilities compared to the Residential Option or Hotel Options.

(3) Schools

Under the West Site Only Alternative, the increase of 918 residential units and 637 employment positions under the Residential Option, or 574 residential units and 1,075 employment positions under the Hotel Options, would result in an increase of direct and indirect residents. Therefore, the West Site Only Alternative would result in an increase of 174 elementary school students, 82 middle school students, and 14 high school students relative to the Residential Option, or 112 elementary school students, 53 middle school students, and 11 high school students relative to the Hotel Options. As a result, the West Site Only Alternative would result in a total increase of 270 students to the LBUSD compared to 399 students under the Residential Option, or 176 students compared to 329 students under the Hotel Options. Thus, impacts to the LBUSD would be less when compared with the proposed project.

(4) Parks and Recreation

The West Site Only Alternative would include the same recreational amenities as those included in the western portion of the project site under the Residential Option and Hotel Options. Specifically, this Alternative would include 170,618 square feet of open space and recreational amenities including landscaping and recreational areas on the roof (deck) of the podium parking structures. The roof deck recreational facilities would include a 5,132-square-foot clubhouse (including a 592-square-foot lobby) and other residential amenities, such as a swimming pool and landscaped deck. However, development of this Alternative would not include providing an 80-foot setback in order to provide the extension of Santa Cruz Park to the southern side of Ocean Boulevard east of Golden Shore, in compliance with Ordinance C-7828. Therefore, this Alternative would result in greater impacts regarding parks and recreation compared to the proposed project.

(5) Libraries

As described above, the West Site Only Alternative would result in a direct or indirect increase in population of a total of 3,124 persons relative to the Residential Option, or 2,444 persons relative to the Hotel Options. Therefore, this Alternative would require an increase of library items and library square footage to maintain the existing services and facilities per capita. However, since the total population impacting the library services and facilities would be reduced compared to the Residential Option and the Hotel Options, impacts would be less than significant. As such, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to library services and facilities compared to the Residential and Hotel Options.

j. Traffic and Parking

The West Site Only Alternative would result in a proportionate decrease of daily vehicle trips impacting the regional and local roadways. However, this Alternative would still result in significant impacts to the surrounding intersections, including a CMP intersection, though these impacts would be incrementally reduced relative to the proposed project's development options. In addition, due to the incremental reduction in the traffic, impacts regarding site access, internal circulation, and emergency access to the site would be less than significant, and less than the proposed project. The West Site Only Alternative would also result in a decrease ridership of public transportation but would require approval of a shared parking plan to ensure parking impacts remain below a level of significance. Regardless, the West Site Alternative would result in fewer impacts to transit and parking.

k. Utilities and Service Systems

(1) Water Supply

Development of the Reduced Density Alternative would result in construction of 918 residential units, 260,000 square feet of office uses, and 20,000 square feet of retail uses (relative to the proposed project's Residential Option), or up to 574 residential units, 260,000 square feet of office uses, 400 hotel rooms, and 19,000 square feet of retail uses (relative to the proposed project's Hotel Options). As such, this Alternative would also require water during construction activities. However, similar to the proposed project, impacts to water supply during construction activities would be less than significant. In addition, this Alternative would result in a total water demand of approximately 262,669 gpd (294.2 AFY) as opposed to a total demand of 380,184 gpd (425.9 AFY) under the Residential Option, or 253,378 gpd (283.8 AFY) as opposed to a total demand of 441,589 gpd (494.6 AFY) under the Hotel Options.⁹ Therefore, there would be fewer impacts to water supply under the West Site Only Alternative compared to the proposed project.

(2) Solid Waste

Similar to the proposed project, the West Site Only Alternative would require the demolition of the existing office buildings and construction of new high-rise buildings resulting

⁹ The calculations for water demand were based upon wastewater generation factors of 150 gpd per 1,000 square feet of office uses, 80 gpd per 1,000 square feet of retail, 120 gpd per one-bedroom residential unit, 160 gpd per two-bedroom residential unit, 200 gpd per 3-bedroom residential unit, and 130 gpd per hotel room. The total wastewater was then multiplied by 25 percent to account for evaporation and water losses.

in a total of 30,288 tons of solid waste relative to the Residential Option, or 29,515 tons relative to the Hotel Options. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a reduction of approximately 18,173 tons of construction solid waste compared to the Residential Option, or 17,752 tons of solid waste compared to the Hotel Options. However, it should be noted that impacts to the County's unclassified landfills would be less than significant with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. In addition, this Alternative would generate approximately 5,332 pounds of solid waste per day as opposed to 7,660 pounds of solid waste per day under the Residential Option, or approximately 4,751 pounds per day as opposed to 7,550 pounds per day under the Hotel Options. Therefore, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts to the County's unclassified landfills and to the County's Class III landfills compared to the proposed project.

3. IMPACT SUMMARY

A comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with the West Site Only Alternative with the environmental impacts anticipated under the Golden Shore Master Plan project is provided in Table V-1 on pages V-6 through V-10. The West Site Only Alternative would result in less impacts to light/glare, shade/shadow, air quality (construction and operational emissions), cultural resources, soil erosion, water quality, noise (construction and operation), population, fire protection, police protection, schools, libraries, traffic and parking, water supply, and solid waste. This Alternative would reduce but would not eliminate the significant air quality and noise impacts during construction, as well as significant traffic impacts to intersections. It should also be noted that impacts would be similar to the proposed project regarding pedestrian wind effects, geology and soils (seismicity, ground shaking, and ground failure), hydrology and drainage, and land use compatibility. However, this Alternative would result in greater impacts in regards to aesthetics/visual quality/views, consistency with the regulatory framework, employment and housing, and parks and recreation.

4. RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Under the West Site Only Alternative, the project design objectives of creating a world-class development project worthy of international recognition, which would become a western icon for downtown Long Beach recognizable from a great distance would still be accomplished. In addition, this Alternative would provide sufficient parking for residents, visitors, patrons, and employees.

The West Site Only Alternative would also provide a mixed-use development that would help to reduce vehicular travel and include sustainable design features to reduce environmental

impacts. West Site Only Alternative would also integrate a livable, walkable and diverse mixed-use development served by local and regional transit within the downtown area. In addition, this Alternative would create a secure, convenient urban neighborhood suited for living and working, with state-of-the-art amenities and public spaces. This Alternative would also create an environment to maximize local public transit throughout the downtown area and would incorporate sustainable design features to maximize energy and water use efficiency, reduce waste and pollutant generation, and minimize consumption of natural resources.

However, the West Site Only Alternative would support the City's economic growth by providing much needed first class hotel rooms (within the west site under the Hotel Options) to support the City's growing convention business, and it would include development of corporate headquarters for two of the City's most prestigious businesses. In addition, this Alternative would provide an increase of high-density housing to support the City's maturing employment hub.

Therefore, the West Site Only Alternative would fulfill the design and development objectives and the economic objectives, but not to the extent the proposed project would.

V. ALTERNATIVES
C. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

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

A comparative summary of the environmental impacts anticipated under each alternative with the environmental impacts associated with the Golden Shore Master Plan project is provided in Table V-1 on pages V-6 through V-10. A more detailed description of the potential impacts associated with each alternative is provided above. Pursuant to Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, the analysis below addresses the ability of the alternatives to “avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects” of the project.

Of the Alternatives analyzed in the EIR, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered the overall environmentally superior alternative as it would reduce all of the significant or potentially significant impacts occurring under the Golden Shore Master Plan project (i.e., visual character, light/glare, local construction air emissions, regional operational air emissions, AQMP consistency, global climate change, pedestrian wind effects, cultural resources, construction and operational noise, and traffic impacts to surrounding local and CMP intersections, parking, fire protection, and solid waste) to levels that are less than significant. However, as indicated above, this Alternative would not meet any of the design, development, or economic objectives established for the Golden Shore Master Plan project.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines’ requirement to identify an environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative, a comparative evaluation of the remaining alternatives indicates that the West Site Only Alternative would be environmentally superior. Relative to the Golden Shore Master Plan project, this Alternative would reduce the significant impacts regarding regional and local construction air emissions, regional operational air emissions, construction and operational global climate change, AQMP consistency, construction noise, and traffic impacts to surrounding intersections, including a CMP

intersection. However, although this Alternative would reduce these impacts, they would still be considered significant and unavoidable. In addition, the West Site Only Alternative would result in reduced impacts regarding light/glare, shade/shadow, construction and operational TACs, local operational air emissions, cultural resources, soil erosion, water quality, construction vibration and operational noise, population, fire protection, police protection, schools, libraries, traffic and parking, water supply, and solid waste, as compared to the Golden Shore Master Plan project's various development options. Impacts regarding pedestrian wind effects, seismic groundshaking, subsidence, liquefaction, and collapse, hydrology/drainage, and land use compatibility would be similar to the impacts that would occur with the proposed project. Some of the impacts that would occur under the West Site Only Alternative would be greater than project impacts, including impacts related to employment, housing, aesthetics/visual quality, views, consistency with regulatory framework, and parks and recreation. In addition, as discussed above, the West Site Only Alternative would generally meet all of the project objectives.