

CHAPTER 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) require that an EIR and EIS describe a range of reasonable alternatives to a project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant environmental impacts. An EIR/EIS is also required to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. This chapter of the PEIR/PEIS describes and evaluates project alternatives and implements the requirements set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines and NEPA Guidance for an alternatives analysis. This chapter also identifies the Environmentally Superior Project Alternative as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) and the Preferred Alternative per NEPA.

4.1 CEQA AND NEPA ALTERNATIVES REQUIREMENTS

CEQA

CEQA requires analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Project to foster informed decision making and public participation (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6 (a)). CEQA states that, the EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the project. A matrix displaying the major characteristics and significant environmental effects of each alternative may be used to summarize the comparison. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6). The alternatives need only “include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6 (d)). Other requirements include:

- Providing a “no project” alternative (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e));
- Explaining why rejected alternatives are considered infeasible (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(c)); and
- Identifying the agency’s “environmentally superior alternative.” If the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, then the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6 (e)(2)).

NEPA

NEPA also requires the analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives be analyzed in an EIS. A reasonable range of alternatives includes those that are practical or feasible from the technical and

economic standpoint. NEPA implementing regulation 40 CFR Section 1502.14 states that the lead agency must rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, devote substantial treatment to each alternative, identify the preferred alternative where one or more exists, and present the environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternatives in comparative form to sharply define the issues and provide a clear basis for a choice among alternatives by the decision maker and the public. Other requirements include:

- Providing a “no action” alternative (40 C.F.R. Section 1502.14(d));
- Explaining why any alternatives were eliminated from detailed analysis (40 C.F.R. Section 1502.14(a));
- Identifying the environmentally preferred alternative (40 C.F.R. Section 1502.14(e)).

With the exception of the required No Action Alternative (in this PEIR/PEIS, the No Action Alternative is referred to as the No Project Alternative for clarity in consistency with CEQA requirements), alternatives to the Proposed Action must meet the stated purpose and need for the project. To be considered reasonable, an alternative has to be technically and economically feasible, needs to be consistent with the basic policy objectives for management of the area (e.g., consistent with land use plan), its implementation must not be remote or speculative, and it must not be substantially similar in design and effects to an alternative that is already analyzed.

4.2 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES

CEQA

The range of alternatives and methods for selection is governed by CEQA and applicable CEQA case law. As stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), the lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. This chapter includes the range of project alternatives that have been selected by the lead agency (in this case, the City) for examination, as well as its reasoning for selecting these alternatives.

As stated in Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, there is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason. This rule is described in Section 15126.6(f) of the State CEQA Guidelines and requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. As defined in Section 15126.6(f), the rule of reason limits alternatives analyzed to those that would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of a project. Of those alternatives, an EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. Other relevant provisions set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines state that EIRs do not need to consider every conceivable alternative to a project, nor are they required to consider

alternatives that are infeasible. As indicated in Chapter 3.0, Environmental Analysis, the Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and transportation and traffic. Consistent with CEQA, the analysis presented in this chapter considers whether a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan (GCSP; Proposed Project) could reduce those impacts. The selection of alternatives and their discussion must “foster informed decision making and public participation” (14 CCR 15126.6(a)).

NEPA

Under NEPA, alternatives are developed to explore other ways of meeting the purpose and need for the Proposed Action. Alternatives to the Proposed Action must be developed to address one more resource issues and have demonstrable impact differences when compared to the Proposed Action. In other words, the EIS must analyze alternatives that are not substantially similar in design and effects to the Proposed Action or other action alternative. As indicated in Chapter 3.0, Environmental Analysis, the Proposed Project would result in adverse effects related to air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and transportation and traffic. Consistent with NEPA, the analysis presented in this chapter presents a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan (GCSP; Proposed Project) that could reduce those impacts.

When the EIS process concludes, the lead agency’s decision is recorded in a public Record of Decision (ROD). The ROD will identify all alternatives considered by the agency in reaching its decision, specify the alternative or alternatives which were considered to be environmentally preferable (40 C.F.R. Section 1505.2(b)). In addition to discussion of alternatives, the ROD shall state “whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted and if not, why they were not” (40 C.F.R. Section 1505.2(C)). Finally, the Preferred Alternative is not necessarily the environmentally superior alternative. NEPA does not require that the agency’s preferred alternative must have the least environmental impact. Therefore, this chapter identifies potential alternatives to the Proposed Project and evaluates them, as required by CEQA and NEPA.

4.2.1 Proposed Project

As described above, a project’s objectives and the significant impacts of a project are key determiners of the alternatives that are initially examined by the lead agency and the alternatives that are ultimately carried forward for detailed analysis in an EIR/EIS. To that end, this subsection includes (a) a summary of the Proposed Project’s characteristics to facilitate comparison between the Proposed Project and its alternatives, (b) a statement of purpose and need for the Proposed Project, (c) the list of Proposed Project objectives, and (d) a summary of the Proposed Project’s significant impacts.

Proposed Project Summary

The Proposed Project provides a framework for the development and improvement of the 437-acre Plan Area, located in the north-central portion of the City of Long Beach (City) on the west and south sides of the Long Beach Airport.

The applicant is the City of Long Beach. The City has developed the GCSP as part of a comprehensive transition program in the wake of the closure of the C-17 Globemaster III military aircraft production facility owned by the Boeing Corporation (C-17 Site). The GCSP will build upon the work developed in phase one of the C-17 Transition Master Plan in 2016 and provide a strategic planning framework for attracting quality industries and improving the character, design, and functionality of the Plan Area. The C-17 Site is located on the east side of Cherry Avenue adjacent to the west side of the Long Beach Airport. The central portion of the Plan Area encompasses the approximately 93-acre former Boeing aircraft manufacturing facility, while the remainder of the Plan Area includes industrial and commercial corridors and nodes along Cherry Avenue and Spring Street.

Building on the legacy of the Boeing aircraft manufacturing industry and the high-quality jobs it provided, the GCSP aims to continue to attract and optimize new work opportunities to retain the regional skills base, expertise, and competitive economies of Long Beach Airport, the City of Long Beach, and the Southern California region. The GCSP represents the next step in the overall transition of the former Boeing C-17 Site and surrounding Plan Area. The GCSP assigns appropriate land use districts for land properties within the Plan Area, including six development districts and two overlay zones. The GCSP establishes a land use and mobility plan, development regulations, design guidelines, infrastructure requirements and implementation strategies necessary to becoming a flexible commercial and industrial district in the City. No residential component is included in the GCSP.

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project

In 2013, Boeing Corporation announced it would end production of the C-17 Globemaster III military aircraft, causing the closure of the C-17 Site in the City of Long Beach. This closure resulted in the layoff of approximately 1,600 workers and caused additional economic impacts across the supply chain. In addition to the manufacturing, engineering, and project management jobs within the aerospace/defense sectors, other job losses within the service realm will occur. Further, the C-17 Site closures leaves vacant a distinctive site, which includes a 1.2 million square foot enclosed production space adjacent to the Long Beach Airport. To address these impacts, the City has undertaken the C-17 Master Plan to provide economic development planning, land use and infrastructure planning, and assistance to impacted firms and workers. As the results of the C-17 Transition Master Plan revealed the need for comprehensive planning that addressed land use, economic development, and

infrastructure improvements in the Plan Area, the City determined that a Specific Plan was the appropriate tool to approach each need holistically. The GCSP meets the City's needs for a comprehensive planning tool to guide land use and infrastructure improvements to enhance the economic functionality of the Plan Area, following the C-17 Site closure.

The purpose of the GCSP is to provide the planning and regulatory framework for guiding future development and attracting quality jobs to the 437-acre Plan Area. The vision of the GCSP is to serve as a 21st Century innovation employment district. Building on the legacy of the Boeing aircraft manufacturing industry and the high-quality jobs it provided, the Plan Area will continue to attract and optimize new work opportunities to retain the regional skills base, expertise and competitive economies of Long Beach Airport, the City of Long Beach, and the Southern California region. The land use districts proposed within the GCSP are intended to create a flexible, commercial and industrial district. In addition, the strategic implementation and administration framework will foster pedestrian, bicycle and transit mobility, improve connectivity, provide open space and amenities, and enhance the design and functionality of the workforce environment. The GCSP will become a destination where leading-edge firms come to leverage its locational advantage adjacent to Long Beach Airport, the Port of Long Beach, I-405 freeway, and a thriving residential and business community.

Project Objectives

The objectives for the Proposed Project include:

- **Create a 21st Century Employment District that Fosters Innovation:** The workforce of the 21st century is seeking places that integrate jobs into active urban lifestyles. The GCSP will guide development and infrastructure investments to integrate business park, industrial, and commercial uses with supporting amenities in a flexible, commercial and industrial, multi-modal and sustainable campus-style environment. This will include breaking down the superblocks into a grid of walkable and bikeable streets and introducing sustainable and thoughtfully designed buildings, sites, open spaces and streetscapes. This goal also recognizes that while innovation has a spatial component (i.e., dynamic clusters of people working together are the source of social and technological breakthroughs), maintaining affordability through adaptive reuse of existing buildings to create small-scale, low-rent, urban environments are important to attract and retain innovators.
- **Stimulate Economic Development and Job Growth:** A principal driver of the GCSP is to stimulate economic growth and attract businesses that replenish high-quality jobs lost from the closure of the former Boeing C-17 manufacturing plant. This will require a level of effort that extends beyond the controls of a land use plan, development standards, and implementing mechanisms found within the pages of the GCSP. Attracting key anchor tenants will rely on a coordinated effort between City staff, independent brokers, politicians, and the right mix of incentives to drive private investment to the district.

- **Cultivate the Existing Human Capital of Long Beach:** Human capital refers to the knowledge, skill sets, and motivation people have, which provide economic value. Human capital is directly related to economic growth as it can help to develop an economy through the knowledge and skills of people. Human capital realizes not everyone has the same skill sets or knowledge and that quality of work can be improved by investing in people's education. In addition to attracting quality businesses, investing in Long Beach's human capital and proactively connecting residents, and in particular former Boeing employees, with new job opportunities in the district, is an important goal of the GCSP.
- **Establish Cherry Avenue as a Multi-Modal Unifying Corridor:** Cherry Avenue is a central unifying backbone for the GCSP and provides key gateways to the district at its intersection with Carson Avenue and Spring Street. The corridor is well-located for future success based on its high visibility, regional accessibility, traffic counts, and proximity to flanking neighborhoods and businesses. The GCSP will guide the development of Cherry Avenue to become an economically thriving corridor with business and commercial infill development strategies that bring neighborhood and business-serving commercial uses, as well as employment opportunities within walking distance of existing neighborhoods. Cherry Avenue will also be improved as a street that enables active transportation, calms traffic, and creates a new identity for the district. Improving the "front door" of the GCSP by both incremental and comprehensive changes to Cherry Avenue will strengthen the economic, environmental, and visual performance of the district as a whole.
- **Increase Mobility Choices Throughout the Globemaster Corridor District:** Multiple transportation options can broaden the benefits of innovation to the City at large. For an innovation district, solid multimodal transportation means district employees have a greater choice of residence and lifestyle options. Connections between local transportation networks and regional or global transportation can also give a district a competitive edge. The GCSP will leverage its local, regional, and global transportation connections by enhancing internal connectivity and increasing mobility options within and to/from the Plan Area. Improvements will be focused on connectivity and accessibility for active transportation modes and shared mobility.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project

The analysis in the Initial Study (IS) (Appendix A) for the Proposed Project determined the Proposed Project would result in either no impacts or less than significant impacts related to the following issue areas: Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Mineral Resources, and Recreation. As described in Chapter 3.0, Environmental Analysis, the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to Aesthetics, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing, Public Services, Utilities and Services Systems, and Environmental Justice. The Proposed Project would result in less than

significant impacts with mitigation incorporated to Energy, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, and Tribal Cultural Resources. The Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas emissions, and Transportation and Traffic. These impacts are summarized below:

Air Quality

Conflict with Air Quality Management Plan

The evaluation of whether the Proposed Project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan is based on the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook. Criterion No. 1 assesses if the Proposed Project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards of the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP. The Proposed Project would potentially conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 1 because the Proposed Project would result exceed the SCAQMD construction thresholds for VOC and NO_x and the SCAQMD operational thresholds for CO, VOC, and PM₁₀, and VOC and PM₁₀ are nonattainment pollutants under the NAAQS and/or CAAQS (VOC as a precursor to O₃, which is the nonattainment pollutant). Because the Proposed Project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, the Proposed Project would potentially conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 1 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not exceed the demographic growth forecasts in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Survey (RTP/SCS); therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) 2016 Air Quality management Plan (AQMP), which based future emission estimates on the SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS. Thus, the Proposed Project would not conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 2. However, because the Proposed Project would potentially conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 1, impacts related to the Proposed Project's potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan is considered potentially significant and mitigation is required. Mitigation measures **MM-AQ-1** (Construction Equipment Emissions Reductions), **MM-AQ-2** (Fugitive Dust Control),¹ and **MM-AQ-3** (Architectural Coating VOC Emissions) would be required to reduce Proposed Project construction-related emissions and mitigation measures **MM-AQ-4** (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), **MM-AQ-5** (Encourage Electric Vehicles), **MM-AQ-6** (Idling Restriction), **MM-AQ-7** (Energy Conservation), **MM-AQ-8** (Low-VOC-Green Cleaning Product Education Program), **MM-AQ-9** (Electric Forklifts), and **MM-AQ-10** (TRU Plug-Ins) would be required to reduce emissions generated during operation of the Proposed Project. Mitigation measure **MM-AQ-1** would reduce

¹ Even though estimated Proposed Project mass daily emissions do not exceed the PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}.

various air pollutant emissions associated with construction equipment operation. Mitigation measure **MM-AQ-2** would reduce dust-related PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions generated during construction and mitigation measure **MM-AQ-3** would reduce VOC emissions generated the application of architectural coating during construction. Mitigation measures **MM-AQ-4**, **MM-AQ-5**, and **MM-AQ-6** aim to reduce operational mobile source emissions of various air pollutants. Mitigation measure **MM-AQ-7** focuses on reducing energy-related operational emissions and mitigation measure **MM-AQ-8** encourages reduction of operational area source VOC emissions. Mitigation measure **MM-AQ-9** would reduce criteria air pollutants by replacing diesel-fueled forklifts with electric forklifts and mitigation measure **MM-AQ-10** would reduce criteria air pollutants generated by TRU idling. Nonetheless, even with the implementation of mitigation, due to the magnitude of emissions associated with buildout of the Proposed Project, potential impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable** under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Nonattainment Criteria Air Pollutants

Because construction specifications are not currently available, under a conservative scenario where maximum emissions from each assessed construction phase would occur concurrently, estimated Proposed Project emissions would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for VOC and NO_x. Emissions of CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} are not estimated to exceed SCAQMD thresholds. The implementation of mitigation measures **MM-AQ-1** through **MM-AQ-3** would be required to reduce Proposed Project construction-related emissions. As described previously, mitigation measure **MM-AQ-1** would reduce various air pollutant emissions associated with construction equipment operation, mitigation measure **MM-AQ-2** would reduce dust-related PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions generated during construction (even though estimated Proposed Project mass daily emissions do not exceed the PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}), and mitigation measure **MM-AQ-3** would reduce VOC emissions generated the application of architectural coating during construction. Nonetheless, even with the implementation of mitigation, Proposed Project-generated construction criteria air pollutant emissions would remain **significant and unavoidable**, under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

During operations, Proposed Project-generated VOC, CO, and PM₁₀ would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds. Mitigation measures **MM-AQ-4** (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), **MM-AQ-5** (Encourage Electric Vehicles), **MM-AQ-6** (Idling Restriction), **MM-AQ-7** (Energy Conservation), **MM-AQ-8** (Low-VOC-Green Cleaning Product Education Program), **MM-AQ-9** (Electric Forklifts), and **MM-AQ-10** (TRU Plug-Ins) would be required to reduce emissions generated during operation of the Proposed Project. Nonetheless, even with the implementation of mitigation, potential impacts during operation of the Proposed Project would remain **significant and unavoidable** under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

Sensitive Receptor Impacts

Sensitive receptors are those individuals more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. To determine the Proposed Project's potential to impact nearby sensitive receptors, a Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) analysis, Carbon Monoxide (CO) hotspots screening evaluation, Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) exposure analysis, and criteria air pollutant health effect evaluation were conducted. The determinations were as follows:

According to the LST analysis, construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would generate PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions in excess of site-specific LSTs; therefore, localized construction impacts would be potentially significant and mitigation is required. Mitigation measures **MM-AQ-1** and **MM-AQ-2** (Construction Equipment Emissions Reduction and Fugitive Dust Control, respectively) would be required to reduce the Proposed Project's construction-related emissions. Nonetheless, site-specific impacts during construction of the Proposed Project would remain **significant and unavoidable** under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

The CO hotspots screening evaluation determined the Proposed Project would not negatively affect the LOS of intersections in the Proposed Project vicinity and would not significantly contribute to a CO hotspot.

The potential health risk of exposing sensitive receptors to construction-generated TAC emissions, primarily DPM, is considered potentially significant and mitigation is required. Implementation of mitigation measure **MM-AQ-1**, which would result in reductions in exhaust PM₁₀ emissions from construction equipment, would be required. Nonetheless, the potential health risk of exposing sensitive receptors to construction-generated TAC emissions, primarily DPM, is considered **significant and unavoidable**. Operational TAC exposure could not be identified due to the uncertainty of future sensitive receptor locations and the effectiveness of TAC reduction measures. However, to reduce the potential for the Proposed Project to expose sensitive receptors to TACs and the associated health risk, mitigation measures **MM-AQ-11** (Health Risk Siting), **MM-AQ-12** (Toxic Air Contaminant Reduction) and **MM-AQ-13** (Health Risk Assessment Requirements) would be implemented. Nonetheless, even with the implementation of mitigation, which cannot be quantified at this time, the Proposed Project would have a **significant and unavoidable** health risk impact as a result of operation under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA. Note that mitigation measures that reduce criteria air pollutants also reduce TACs, specifically mitigation measures **MM-AQ-6** (Idling Restriction), **MM-AQ-9** (Electric Forklifts), and **MM-AQ-10** (TRU Plug-Ins).

Nonetheless, even with the implementation of mitigation, which cannot be quantified at this time, the Proposed Project would have a **significant and unavoidable** health risk impact as a result of operation under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

Based on the criteria air pollutant evaluation, because construction and operation of the Proposed Project could result in exceedances of the SCAQMD significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀, the potential health effects associated with criteria air pollutants are considered potentially significant. The implementation of mitigation measures **MM-AQ-1** through **MM-AQ-3** would be required to reduce the Proposed Project's construction-related emissions, and the implementation of mitigation measures **MM-AQ-4** through **MM-AQ-10** would be required to reduce emissions generated during operation of the Proposed Project. Nonetheless, even with the implementation of mitigation, potential impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable** during both construction and operation under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

Cultural Resources

Adverse Change in the Significance of a Historical Resource

This programmatic project is specifically planning and rezoning for the Plan Area. No ground-disturbing project-level activities are proposed as part of the Proposed Project. However, subsequent future projects that could be implemented as a result of the GCSP could potentially impact previously-recorded CEQA historical resources and those properties that contain buildings and structures 45 years old or older that have not been identified.

There are known historical resources in the Plan Area and the potential for more properties that have not been evaluated and could be CEQA historical resources. In particular, the Plan Area includes resources that are recently reaching 45 years or more of age and are associated with periods of Long Beach history not fully documented in the Historic Context Statement. Preservation of these modern buildings may not be feasible or consistent with the goals of the GCSP. Furthermore, as these resources are not listed, may be eligible for local listing but not the state or national register, impacts under CEQA will differ from NEPA.

Implementation of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-1**, which requires future project proponents to ensure that potential impacts to historical resources be assessed at the project level, and that properties 45 years old or older be evaluated for historical significance prior to initiation of any project-related activities that could identify significant impacts to historic properties. Development under the proposed GCSP has a potential for demolishing structures that are eligible for historic significance.

In the event, a future development proposal could result in the demolition of a historical resource, the inclusion of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-2** would ensure that the historic structure is documented pursuant to the guidelines of Historic American Building Survey (HABS)-level III. This documentation would be prepared by a qualified professional in the field. Due to the potential loss of historic age structures with implementation of the GCSP, significant impacts would remain after the incorporation of identified mitigation. As such, impacts would be **significant and unavoidable** under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would result in GHG emissions. As shown in Table 3.4-2 (see Section 3.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), the estimated total GHG emissions during construction of would total approximately 28,492 MT CO_{2e} over the assumed 20-year construction period. Estimated Proposed Project-generated construction emissions amortized over 30 years would be approximately 950 MT CO_{2e} per year. As shown in Table 3.4-3 (see Section 3.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), estimated annual Proposed Project-generated GHG emissions would be approximately 120,999 MT CO_{2e} per year as a result of Proposed Project operations only. As the Existing Scenario is estimated to generate 57,783 MT CO_{2e} per year, the net change in emissions is estimated to be 63,216 MT CO_{2e} per year. After accounting for amortized Proposed Project construction emissions, total net GHGs generated by the Proposed Project would be approximately 64,166 MT CO_{2e} per year. As such, annual operational GHG emissions with amortized construction emissions would exceed the SCAQMD threshold of 3,000 MT CO_{2e} per year.

Because the Proposed Project would exceed the Tier 3 SCAQMD threshold of 3,000 MT CO_{2e} per year, a Tier 4 analysis is conducted to evaluate the Proposed Project's efficiency on a service population basis. The Tier 4 efficiency metric threshold used is 1.92 MT CO_{2e}/SP/year consistent with the RDEIR prepared for the General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Elements Project (City of Long Beach 2019b), which is also a plan-level analysis with a 2040 buildout year. The efficiency metric threshold used is 1.92 MT CO_{2e}/SP/year is more stringent than the proposed SCAQMD 2035 efficiency metric of 4.1 MT CO_{2e}/SP/year for plan level analyses. As shown in Table 3.4-3, the Proposed Project would generate approximately 120,999 MT CO_{2e} per year as a result of Proposed Project operations only; however, the net change between the Proposed Project and Existing, plus amortized Proposed Project construction emissions, is 64,166 MT CO_{2e} per year. The Proposed Project's service population, which is defined as residents plus employees, consists solely of employees as the Proposed Project does not include a residential land use component. Per the Proposed Project's job projection analysis, the estimated service population (i.e., employees) for the Proposed Project is 11,170 (Svesson 2020).² Accordingly, the Proposed Project is estimated to result in 5.74 MT CO_{2e}/SP/year (64,166 MT CO_{2e}/year ÷ 11,170 SP), which would exceed the applied efficiency metric threshold 1.92 MT CO_{2e}/SP/year.

² As explained in Chapter 2.0, Project Description and Section 3.2, Air Quality, in 2040, the estimated job absorption for the Proposed Project is 4,884; the remaining 6,286 jobs are anticipated to occur after 2040. However, the emission inventory for the Proposed Project, as presented in Table 3.4-3, assumes buildout of the entire GCSP by 2040. Therefore, it is appropriate to assume the full employment projection to estimate an efficiency metric when using full buildout emissions as the basis.

Therefore, the Proposed Project’s GHG contribution would be cumulatively considerable and is potentially significant. Implementation of mitigation measures **MM-AQ-1** (Construction Equipment Emissions Reductions), **MM-AQ-4** (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), **MM-AQ-5** (Encourage Electric Vehicles), **MM-AQ-6** (Idling Restriction), **MM-AQ-7** (Energy Conservation), **MM-AQ-9** (Electric Forklifts), **MM-AQ-10** (TRU Plug-Ins), **MM-GHG-1** (Water Conservation), and **MM-GHG-2** (Solid Waste Reduction) would reduce Proposed Project-generated GHG emissions. However, even with the implementation of mitigation, impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable** under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

The Proposed Project would potentially conflict with plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, and as such, impacts are considered potentially significant. As discussed previously, implementation of mitigation measures **MM-AQ-1** (Construction Equipment Emissions Reductions), **MM-AQ-4** (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), **MM-AQ-5** (Encourage Electric Vehicles), **MM-AQ-6** (Idling Restriction), **MM-AQ-7** (Energy Conservation), **MM-AQ-9** (Electric Forklifts), **MM-AQ-10** (TRU Plug-Ins), **MM-GHG-1** (Water Conservation), and **MM-GHG-2** (Solid Waste Reduction) would reduce Proposed Project-generated GHG emissions and associated impacts related to the potential to conflict with applicable GHG emissions reduction plans, policies, or regulations. In addition to the various mitigation measures required, the City is in the process of developing a Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) to ensure that the City continues on a trajectory that aligns with the short-term, interim, and long-term State GHG reduction goals. Implementation of the CAAP would contribute to reducing GHG emissions resulting from Proposed Project implementation to the extent applicable to non-residential land use development. However, no credit for the Citywide emissions reduction plan was taken, as the implementation of the CAAP is speculative until its approved. Even with the implementation of mitigation, impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable** under CEQA.

Transportation

Existing (Year 2018) Plus Project Conditions

The Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix D) evaluates the Proposed Project-related impacts at 28 key study intersections per City of Long Beach and City of Signal Hill significant impact criteria. Under the Existing (2018) Plus Project Intersection Peak Hour Levels of Service, six of the key intersections are forecast to operate adversely with the addition of Proposed Project Traffic. Five of these intersections are considered significantly impacted compared to LOS standards. With the implementation of mitigation measures **MM-TRAF-1** through **MM-TRAF-5**, all intersections would operate at acceptable LOS conditions under Existing (Year 2018) Plus Project conditions.

Although the intersection of Orange Avenue/I-405 southbound ramps is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS F in the AM and PM peak hour, the intersection is not considered affected when compared to the LOS standards utilized by City of Long Beach, which specifies that an unsignalized intersection impact is considered to be significant if the project causes an intersection at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E or F. Also, preliminary review of the existing volumes indicate that the intersection satisfies the criteria for the installation of a traffic signal. Should Caltrans or the City of Long Beach desire to install a traffic signal at this location, the Proposed Project may be expected to pay a fair-share of the total cost.

Year 2040 Plus Project Conditions

Under the Year 2040 Baseline Plus Project traffic conditions, 10 of the key intersections are forecast to operate adversely with the addition of Proposed Project traffic, and are considered significantly impacted when compared to the LOS standards utilized by City of Long Beach. Implementation of mitigation measures **MM-TRAF-5** through **MM-TRAF-13** at the significantly impacted intersections will completely offset the Proposed Project's impact and improve the LOS to acceptable conditions.

Although the intersection of Orange Avenue/I-405 southbound ramps is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS F in the AM and PM peak hour, the intersection is not considered affected when compared to the LOS standards utilized by City of Long Beach, which specifies that an operational deficiency occurs if the project causes an intersection at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E or F. Since the study intersection currently operates at an adverse LOS under existing traffic conditions, the Proposed Project's affect is not considered to be adverse or unacceptable. Although this intersection is not considered significantly impacted, it does operate adversely under existing traffic conditions. Also, preliminary review of the existing volumes indicate that the intersection satisfies the criteria for the installation of a traffic signal. Should Caltrans or the City of Long Beach desire to install a traffic signal at this location, future development under the Proposed Project may be expected to pay a fair-share of the total cost.

Caltrans Facilities Analysis

In conformance with the current Caltrans *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies*, dated December 2002, existing and projected peak hour operating conditions at the four state-controlled study intersections within the study area have been evaluated using the *Highway Capacity Manual* operations method of analysis.

An analysis of Caltrans Facilities indicates that the Proposed Project would impact the I-405 Southbound Off-Ramp/Spring Street intersection under Existing Plus Project traffic conditions. Although the intersection of Orange Avenue/I-405 southbound ramps currently and is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS F in the AM and PM peak hour, impacts are not considered significant.

The significance impact criteria of the City of Long Beach specifies that an unsignalized intersection impact is considered to be significant if the project causes an intersection at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E or F. Although this intersection is not considered significantly impacted, it does operate adversely under existing traffic conditions. Also, preliminary review of the existing volumes indicate that the intersection satisfies the criteria for the installation of a traffic signal. Should Caltrans or the City of Long Beach desire to install a traffic signal at this location, the Project may be expected to pay a fair-share of the total cost. With the implementation of mitigation measure **MM-TRAF-9**, the I-405 Southbound Off-Ramp/Spring Street intersection would operate at acceptable LOS conditions.

The Proposed Project would also impact the I-405 Southbound Off-Ramp/Spring Street intersection, along with I-405 Northbound Ramp/32nd Street intersection, under Year 2040 Plus Project. With the implementation of mitigation measures **MM-TRAF-9** and **MM-TRAF-14**, the I-405 Southbound Off-Ramp/Spring Street intersection and the I-405 Northbound Ramp/32nd Street intersection would operate at acceptable LOS conditions.

The mitigation measures in Section 3.11.6, Mitigation Measures (see Section 3.11, Transportation, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS) identify when the proposed improvements would fall under the authority of another jurisdiction or require additional right-of-way acquisition causing operational deficiencies or conflicts with the intent of the specific plan. All identified mitigation measures were determined to be infeasible, therefore, all impacts related to consistency with established LOS metrics are considered **significant and unavoidable**.

4.2.2 Alternatives Considered But Rejected

One of the requirements for alternatives analysis that is set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines and NEPA Guidelines is identification of alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process. As stated in Section 15126.6(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR should briefly explain the reasons underlying this determination. Additionally, NEPA requires an explanation why any alternatives were eliminated from detailed analysis (40 CFR Section 1502.14(a)). Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR/EIS are:

- (i) Failure to meet most of the basic project objectives,
- (ii) Infeasibility, or
- (iii) Inability to avoid significant environmental impacts

Section 15126.6(f)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that “among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory

limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent).” However, as stated in this subsection, no one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives.

In accordance with 15126.6(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines and 40 CFR 1502.14(a) of the NEPA Guidelines, alternatives were considered but rejected from further analysis due to one or more of the above reasons. A description of each alternative and the rationale for rejection is provided below.

Alternative Development Area

Section 1516.2(f)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that if the lead agency concludes no feasible alternative locations exist, it must disclose the reasons for this conclusion, and should include the reasons in the EIR. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Proposed Project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR (State Guidelines § 15126.6(f)(2)(A)). In general, any development of the size and type proposed by the Proposed Project would have substantially the same impacts on air quality, GHG emissions, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, and utilities and service systems. Since the City is highly urbanized, impacts to transportation would also occur in other areas of the City. Without a site-specific analysis, impacts on aesthetics, biological resources, energy geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, and environmental justice cannot be evaluated. These impacts were found to be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, another location would not avoid or substantially lessen the effects of the Proposed Project. The City of Long Beach is largely built out and redevelopment in other areas of the City has potential to encounter unknown cultural and tribal cultural resources.

Additionally, per NEPA guidance, an alternative should fulfill the purpose and need of the Proposed Project. As discussed in Section 1.1, Summary and Scope of the Proposed Project, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS, the Plan Area encompasses the approximately 93-acre former Boeing aircraft manufacturing facilities, while the remainder of the Plan Area includes industrial and commercial corridors and nodes along Cherry Avenue and Spring Street. The GCSP represents the next step in the overall transition of the former Boeing C-17 Site and surrounding Plan Area. The GCSP assigns appropriate land use districts for land properties within the Plan Area, including six districts and two overlay zones. The GCSP establishes a land use and mobility plan, development regulations, design guidelines, infrastructure requirements and implementation strategies necessary to becoming a flexible commercial and industrial district in the City. Since the Proposed Project is part of the strategic planning effort for the C-17 Site closure, developing the GCSP in another area of the City is not feasible. An alternative location would not provide the planning and regulatory framework to redevelop the C-17 Site on another location. Therefore, an alternative location would not fulfill the purpose and need of the Proposed Project

4.3 ALTERNATIVES CARRIED FORWARD FOR CONSIDERATION

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines and NEPA requirements, the City selected a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Project that would fulfill the purpose and need of the Proposed Project, feasibly attain most of the basic objectives, and avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the effects of the Proposed Project. Each of the selected alternatives is described below. Pursuant to Section 15126.6(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines and NEPA implementing regulation 40 CFR 1502.14, these descriptions include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the Proposed Project.

Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment, the discussion of alternatives is required to focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly. The alternatives presented below would all avoid or substantially lessen at least one of the significant impacts of the Proposed Project that have been identified in Section 3, Environmental Analysis, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS.

For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that all of the alternatives would comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations, policies, and ordinances. It is also assumed that all mitigation measures required for Proposed Project implementation would apply to the Proposed Project alternatives and similar reductions in impacts would be achieved through such mitigation. Therefore, the following discussion focuses on the ability of the alternatives to further reduce Proposed Project impacts, as well as the potential impacts of the Proposed Project alternatives related to these issues.

4.3.1 Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

Section 15126.6(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate the specific alternative of “no project” along with its impact. Similarly, NEPA requires the inclusion of a “no action” alternative (40 CFR Section 1502.14(d)). As stated in this section of the State CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project. As specified in Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the no project alternative for a development project consists of the circumstance under which a project does not proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) further states that “in certain instances, the no project alternative means ‘no build’ wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained.” Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides guidance related to establishing the existing environmental setting that is used to define the “no project” alternative. As stated in this section, “the ‘no project’ analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation

is published... 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.”

Alternative 1 assumes that the environmental conditions of the Plan Area at the time that the Notice of Preparation was released (September 2018). As such, under Alternative 1, the existing uses within the Plan Area would continue to function as they currently do into the foreseeable future. As stated in Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the lead agency is required to examine conditions that are reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Proposed Project were not approved. The “no project” alternative assumes continuation of the existing plan, policy, or operation into the future. Therefore, redevelopment within the Plan Area would continue to occur under the guidance of the existing 2019 General Plan and zoning regulations.

The Plan Area currently consists of the following zoning areas: Douglas Aircraft Planned Development District (PD-19), IG (General Industrial), IL (Light Industrial), IM (Medium Industrial), CHW (Regional Highway Commercial), CS (Commercial Storage), CCA (Community Commercial Automobile-Oriented), R-1-N (Single-Family Residential, standard lot), P (Park), I (Institutional), and PD-13 (Atlantic Aviation Center Planned Development District). The majority of the Plan Area is built out; however, redevelopment that is consistent with the applicable designation could result in an increase in intensity.

Ability to Fulfill Purpose and Need/Meet Project Objectives

Implementation of Alternative 1 would allow redevelopment to occur in accordance with the City’s existing General Plan and zoning regulations. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not provide the planning and regulatory framework to guide future development of the Plan Area, following the C-17 Site closure. In order to address the economic impacts resulting from the layoff of approximately 1,600 works and other jobs within the aerospace/defense sectors, the City determined a new planning and infrastructure planning document would enhance the economic functionality of the C-17 site and surrounding area.

As such, implementation of a strategic framework, such as the GCSP would address these economic impacts. Alternative 1 would not result in the creation of a planning and regulatory framework, to address economic impacts of the C-17 site closure, and thus, would not fulfill the purpose and need for the Proposed Project.

The GCSP’s combined land use and mobility plan expands mobility choices and creates a safe, efficient, balanced, and multimodal network to accommodate all travelers. The land use and mobility plan are designed to enhance connectivity through new streets and pathways and expand mobility choices through multimodal street improvements. The GCSP involves the implementation of new streets and pedestrian connectors, which would be installed by developers

incrementally as parcels are developed. Streets within the GCSP are divided into four street classifications and a pathway system: Major Avenue, Minor Avenue, Neighborhood Connector, Local Street, and Pedestrian Connection. Street classifications are consistent with the General Plan Mobility Element. The Pedestrian Connection typology represents pathways providing pedestrian/bicycle access through parcels. Improvements to existing streets and the design of new streets are important aspects of the GCSP. Bicycle facilities are proposed for Cherry Avenue, Wardlow Road, and all new streets in the Plan Area to help improve connectivity within the plan area and connect to existing bicycle infrastructure within the vicinity of the plan area, strengthening Long Beach’s commitment to be the nation’s most bicycle-friendly city.

Alternative 1 does not include this planning and regulatory framework to guide land use and transportation infrastructure improvements called for in the General Plan Mobility Element, General Plan Land Use Element, and California Complete Streets Act of 2008. As such, Alternative 1 would not be fully consistent with the infrastructure improvements identified in the General Plan Mobility Element, General Plan Land Use Element, and California Complete Streets Act of 2008. The Proposed Project’s enhancement of connectivity of streets and bicycle infrastructure would be consistent with applicable mobility planning for the City and State. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not fulfill the purpose and need or meet project objectives related to the need for comprehensive planning that addresses land use, economic development, and infrastructure (multimodal) improvements.

Additionally, none of Proposed Project objectives would be achieved under this alternative. Although the current City guidance provides some guidance for future redevelopment, it does not give equal consideration to the number of jobs lost as a result of the Boeing C-17 Site closure. The principal driver of the Proposed Project is stimulating economic development and job growth. Alternative 1 would not create development regulations for the Plan Area to create a 21st century employment district that fosters innovation and cultivates the existing human capital of Long Beach. In addition, continuation of the existing policies and plans would not allow for the establishment of Cherry Avenue as a multimodal unifying corridor to the extent as proposed under the GCSP. Further, there would be no enhancement of internal connectivity and increase in mobility options within the Plan Area.

Nonetheless, CEQA and NEPA require an evaluation of the “no project”/ “no action” alternative so that decision makers can compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project. As such, the purpose of Alternative 1 is to provide sufficient comparison of environmental resources between the “no project” or “no action” alternative with the Proposed Project.

Comparison of the Effects of Alternative 1 to the Proposed Project

Aesthetics

Under Alternative 1, future redevelopment within the Plan Area could result in a change to the existing visual character. Similar to the Proposed Project, any new redevelopment under Alternative 1 would be designed in accordance with applicable development strategies, policies, and standards. Unlike the Proposed Project, Alternative 1 would not include development standards and design guidelines to unify the Plan Area through six development districts and two overlay zones. Additionally, Alternative 1 would not preserve visual corridors along major and minor streetscapes through the six development districts and two overlay zones. Alternative 1 would have similar light and glare impacts, and would comply with applicable City development and design standards. Overall, aesthetic impacts associated with Alternative 1 would be greater than the Proposed Project.

Air Quality

This alternative would allow for redevelopment to occur within the Plan Area in accordance with the existing General Plan and zoning regulations. Thus, redevelopment could result in an increase in intensity and would substantially increase emissions of criteria air pollutants from construction and operational activities. The redevelopment could also result in construction and greater operational emissions near sensitive receptors. However, under Alternative 1, it is unlikely the 93-acre C-17 Site would be redeveloped as new Business Park District because the current zoning is Douglas Aircraft Planned Development District (PD-19). Thus, the maximum construction and operational emissions associated with this portion of the Plan Area would be reduced as compared to the Proposed Project. As such, no significant and unavoidable air quality impacts would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, impacts under Alternative 1 would be less than the Proposed Project.

Cultural Resources

New development under the current zoning could impact the same properties that would be impacted under the Proposed Project. Therefore, as with the Proposed Project, redevelopment under Alternative 1 could result in an impact on known and/or unknown cultural resources. However, under Alternative 1, it is unlikely the 93-acre C-17 Site would be redeveloped as new Business Park District because the current zoning is Douglas Aircraft Planned Development District (PD-19). Thus, the maximum construction and potential for demolition of eligible historic structures associated with the Plan Area would be reduced as compared to the Proposed Project. Under Alternative 1 and the Proposed Project, potential impacts to cultural resources would be significant with mitigation if historic-age structures are demolished and/or modified. Therefore, cultural resources impacts under this alternative would be less than those of the Proposed Project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under Alternative 1, redevelopment could occur that is consistent with existing General Plan regulations and zoning. As such, Alternative 1 would result in GHG emissions associated with new construction and potential increases in operational activities. Additionally, Alternative 1 would not implement a number of beneficial elements that would occur under the Proposed Project, including the Proposed Project's objective related to multimodal transportation. However, due to the restrictive zoning regulations of the existing 93-acre C-17 Site, it is unlikely that this area would be redeveloped, and as such, would remain vacant. This alternative would not produce any construction or operational GHG emissions on the C-17 Site. As such, no significant and unavoidable impacts would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, impacts under Alternative 1 would be less than the Proposed Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Redevelopment in accordance with the existing zoning within the Plan Area would result in similar impacts related to the presence of known or suspected on-site contamination. As with the Proposed Project, future redevelopment under Alternative 1 has the potential to encounter contaminated soils during grading activities and/or the potential to release asbestos-containing materials and lead based paint during demolition. Impacts under Alternative 1 would be, as is the case with the Proposed Project, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, the overall impacts under Alternative 1 are similar to the Proposed Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Redevelopment under Alternative 1 could alter existing drainage patterns and the amount of runoff coming from the Plan Area. Short-term construction and long-term operational water quality impacts would be similar to the Proposed Project and would similarly be required to comply with the Construction General Permit and the City's MS4 Permit. However, since Alternative 1 would not implement an infrastructure plan for the entire Plan Area, drainage improvements that would occur under the Proposed Project would not occur under Alternative 1. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts would be greater under Alternative 1, as compared to the Proposed Project.

Land Use and Planning

Given that the GCSP would not be adopted under Alternative 1, a Zoning Code Amendment would not be required. The existing zoning designations of the Plan Area would remain, and redevelopment would occur consistent with the City's General Plan land use and zoning designations. However, Alternative 1 would not implement a number of beneficial elements that would occur under the Proposed Project, including enhancements to the Cherry Avenue corridor, design guidelines promoting quality design, complete street networks, and development in accordance with a unified specific plan.

Most notably, Alternative 1 would result in employment growth less than the horizon year jobs projected by SCAG, therefore, contributing to the job-poor status of the City of Long Beach. Alternative 1 would also fall short of the job generation goals of the 2019 General Plan Land Use Element. The jobs-poor status of the City could thereby result in increased vehicle commuting due to residents traveling out of the City for employment. Overall, land use impacts would be greater under Alternative 1 when compared to the Proposed Project.

Noise

Under Alternative 1, redevelopment within the Plan Area would continue to occur as permitted by the City's General Plan and existing zoning regulations. Redevelopment could result in construction noise, as would occur under the Proposed Project. Additionally, intensification of redevelopment could increase stationary on-site noise and off-site traffic noise. However, due to the restrictive zoning regulations of the existing 93-acre C-17 Site, it is unlikely that this area would be redeveloped, and as such, would remain vacant. Therefore, this alternative would likely not produce any construction or operational noise on the C-17 Site. Therefore, impacts under Alternative 1 would be less when compared to the Proposed Project.

Population and Housing

Under Alternative 1, redevelopment within the Plan Area would continue to occur as permitted by the City's General Plan and existing zoning regulations. Similarly as with the Proposed Project, Alternative 1 would likely result in population and employment growth, to a lesser degree than the job growth under the Proposed Project. Alternative 1 would fall short of the job generation goals of the 2019 General Plan Land Use Element and SCAG plan projections for the horizon year, therefore, resulting in increased vehicle commuting due to the job-poor status of City of Long Beach. The Proposed Project does not propose housing, and the majority of the Plan Area is built out with industrial, commercial, and retail uses. As with the Proposed Project, impacts would be less than significant under Alternative 1, but this alternative would be inconsistent with SCAG policies regard to improving the jobs ratio goals for the City of Long Beach. Therefore, impacts are similar when compared to the Proposed Project, but the job-poor status of the City of Long Beach would be worse under Alternative 1, as compared to the Proposed Project.

Public Services

Under Alternative 1, redevelopment within the Plan Area would continue to occur as permitted by the City's General Plan and existing zoning regulations. As with the Proposed Project, an increase in development intensity, as permitted, would result in an increase in fire and police protection services. However, as with the Proposed Project, impacts would be less than significant. Nonetheless, given the Plan Area is largely built out, it is unlikely that redevelopment would increase the demand for public services. Therefore, impacts under Alternative 1 would be similar to the Proposed Project.

Transportation

Redevelopment under Alternative 1 would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system; however, unlike the Proposed Project, Alternative 1 would not increase multimodal transportation. The existing zoning in the Plan Area does not include the design guidelines, infrastructure enhancements, or a cohesive mobility plan that would facilitate the bicycle and pedestrian improvements on Cherry Avenue, Spring Street, and Orange Avenue that are specifically designated in the Mobility Element and Bike Master Plan. The Bicycle Master Plan identifies Backbone Next Step Facilities, which would stretch across the City from the northern border to the southern border, as well as the eastern border to the western border. The Orange Avenue Backbone Project would add 4 miles of Class IV parking protected bike lanes that will close network gaps, and improve existing infrastructure throughout Orange and Alamos Avenues improving safety, mobility, multi – modal connectivity and equality for bicyclist of all ages and abilities (8-80). Additionally, Spring Street has been identified as a Backbone Next Step Facility.

The Proposed Project would set forth a Mobility Plan to allow for the bicycle improvements called out in the Mobility Element. Under Alternative 1, the existing zoning would not facilitate the bike improvements proposed in the Bicycle Master Plan, and thus, would not reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Therefore, without the facilitation of these multimodal infrastructure improvements, buildout of the specific plan area under existing zoning would not provide bicycle and pedestrian facilities aimed at reducing VMT, as contemplated in the 2019 General Plan Land Use Element.

As further discussed in Section 3.11, Transportation, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS, the Year 2040 Baseline traffic projections account for an increase in existing traffic volumes due to overall regional growth, based on historical rates of growth identified in the CMP. Thus, should the Proposed Project not receive approval, and redevelopment within the Plan Area occurs consistent with existing regulations, the Year 2040 Baseline condition is representative of Alternative 1. Under the Year 2040 Baseline traffic conditions, 3 of the 26 key study intersections (Orange Avenue at Spring Street, Redondo Avenue at Spring Street, and Orange Avenue at Willow Street) are forecast to operate at a deficient LOS. The Year 2040 plus Project traffic conditions would result in a significant impact at 16 of the key study intersections, including the key intersections forecast to operate at a deficient LOS under Year 2040 Baseline traffic conditions. Although Alternative 1 would not impact all 16 key study intersections, this alternative would not eliminate significant and unavoidable impacts to three intersections (Orange Avenue at Spring Street, Redondo Avenue at Spring Street, and Orange Avenue at Willow Street). Nonetheless, Alternative 1 would result in an impact at fewer key intersections. Therefore, overall transportation impacts under Alternative 1 would be less when compared to the Proposed Project.

Tribal Cultural Resources

New development under the current zoning could impact the same properties that would be impacted under the Proposed Project. Therefore, as with the Proposed Project, development under Alternative 1 could result in an impact on known and/or unknown tribal cultural resources. Under Alternative 1 and the Proposed Project, potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would be significant without mitigation. As such, tribal cultural resource impacts under Alternative 1 would be similar to those of the Proposed Project, and as such, would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, tribal cultural resource impacts under Alternative 1 would be similar when compared to the Proposed Project.

Utilities and Service Systems

Under Alternative 1, redevelopment could result in an increase in development intensity compared to the existing condition. The increased intensity could lead to an increase in wastewater, runoff, water demand, and generation of solid waste. Therefore, impacts to utilities and service systems under Alternative 1 would be similar to the Proposed Project, and as such, would be less than significant.

Environmental Justice

Under Alternative 1, development within the Plan Area would continue to occur as permitted by the City's General Plan and existing zoning regulations. As discussed in Section 3.14, Environmental Justice, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS, the neighborhood adjacent to the Plan Area is not considered a minority or low-income population. As is the case with the Proposed Project, any environmental impacts resulting from redevelopment would not disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations. Therefore, the overall impacts under Alternative 1 would be similar to those of the Proposed Project, and as such, would be less than significant.

Comparison of Environmental Impacts

Unlike the Proposed Project, Alternative 1 would not include development standards and design guidelines to unify the Plan Area through six development districts and two overlay zones. As such, Alternative 1 would result in greater impacts related aesthetics, hydrology and water quality, and land use and planning. Under Alternative 1, it is unlikely the 93-acre C-17 Site would be redeveloped as new Business Park District because the current zoning is Douglas Aircraft Planned Development District (PD-19). Thus, the maximum construction and operational emissions associated with this portion of the Plan Area would be reduced as compared to the Proposed Project. Thus, Alternative 1 would have fewer environmental impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation and traffic. Nonetheless since some redevelopment could occur under Alternative 1, development impacts would be similar with the Proposed Project as related to cultural

resources, hazards and hazardous materials, population and housing, public services, tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, and environmental justice.

4.3.2 Alternative 2 – Reduced Project Alternative

Alternative 2 would allow for the same proposed land use designations within the GCSP. However, Alternative 2 represents a Reduced Project Alternative by reducing the development potential from 8,906,403 square feet to 5,245,331 square feet. A comparison of the overall buildout summaries of Alternative 2 and the Proposed Project is provided in Table 4-1.

**Table 4-1
Development Potential Comparison**

Land Uses	Development Potential (square feet)	
	Alternative 2	Proposed Project
General Office	1,502,134	1,872,602
Medical Office	53,016	146,095
R&D	212,065	234,651
Manufacturing	2,397,684	1,131,139
Light Industrial/Warehousing	600,669	4,455,892
Retail	371,763	795,457
Restaurant	17,000	107,623
Hotel	91,000	162,944
Total	5,245,331	8,906,403

Ability to Fulfill Purpose and Need/Meet Project Objectives

Alternative 2 would provide a framework for the development and improvement of the 437-acre Plan Area. Additionally, Alternative 2 would assign appropriate land use districts for land properties within the Plan Area, including six development districts and two overlay zones. Similar to the GCSP, Alternative 2 establishes a land use and mobility plan, development regulations, design guidelines, infrastructure requirements, and implementation strategies necessary to becoming a flexible commercial and industrial district in the City. As such, Alternative 2 would implement a strategic framework to address the economic impacts associated with the C-17 Site closure, and thus, would fulfill the purpose and need for the Proposed Project as required by CEQA and NEPA.

Additionally, Alternative 2 would help meet most of the objectives identified for the Proposed Project. Specifically, Alternative 2 would create a 21st century employment district through guiding development within the Plan Area. Additionally, Alternative 2 would stimulate economic development and growth, and cultivate existing human capital in Long Beach, through

redevelopment of the former Boeing C-17 manufacturing plant. However, given the reduction in development potential, Alternative 2 would not fully meet the economic objectives of the Proposed Project. Finally, Alternative 2 would also implement a mobility plan to establish Cherry Avenue as a multimodal unifying corridor and increase mobility choices throughout the Plan Area.

Comparison of the Effects of Alternative 2 to the Proposed Project

Aesthetics

Under Alternative 2, the density and intensity of development would be reduced. Given less redevelopment would occur, this alternative would result in fewer changes to the existing visual character compared to the Proposed Project. Although buildout intensity would be less, height standards, setbacks, and design guidelines would still apply. The light and glare impacts under Alternative 2 are similar to the Proposed Project and would be typical of low- and mid-rise industrial, and commercial/retail land uses in the region and City. Therefore, impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar when compared to the Proposed Project.

Air Quality

Under Alternative 2, the reduction in development potential would require less construction activity than the Proposed Project. With the reduction in construction under Alternative 2, there would be less construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions and fewer construction-related air quality impacts. However, as shown on Table 3.2-10 (see Section 3.2, Air Quality, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), estimated Proposed Project emissions would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for VOC, NO_x, and PM₁₀. Given, the Proposed Project is exceedingly over the SCAQMD thresholds for VOC and NO_x, it is likely that Alternative 2 would also result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to these emissions during construction.

Alternative 2 would represent a decrease in development potential from 8,906,403 square feet to 5,245,331 square feet. As such, this alternative would have fewer trips, resulting in a reduction in mobile source emissions. Alternative 2 would generate fewer area and energy source emissions than the Proposed Project due to the reduction in building space. Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative 2 would also meet regulatory energy efficiency requirements through redevelopment. However, as shown on Table 3.2-11 (see Section 3.2, Air Quality, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), the Proposed Project is exceedingly over the SCAQMD thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Therefore, although Alternative 2 would reduce source emissions, the emissions would also result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts. Therefore, the air quality impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to those created by the Proposed Project

Cultural Resources

Construction activities for Alternative 2 would be reduced from those created by the Proposed Project, due to the decrease in new construction area. The development potential would be reduced from 10,888,122 square feet to 5,245,331 square feet. However, new development could impact the same properties that would be impacted under the Proposed Project. Therefore, as with the Proposed Project, redevelopment under Alternative 2 could result in an impact on known and/or unknown cultural resources. Under Alternative 2 and the Proposed Project, potential impacts to cultural resources would remain significant with mitigation due to the potential for demolition of historic resources. Therefore, cultural resources impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to those created by the Proposed Project, and as such, would be significant and unavoidable.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under Alternative 2, the reduction in development potential would require less construction activity than the Proposed Project. With the reduction in construction under Alternative 2, there would be less construction-related GHG emissions and fewer construction-related GHG impacts. Additionally, this reduction in development potential would decrease emissions sources associated with the operation of future development. Alternative 2 would have fewer trips, resulting in a reduction in mobile source emissions. Alternative 2 would generate fewer area energy, solid waste, water supply, and wastewater source emissions than the Proposed Project due to the overall reduction in proposed building area. However, as shown in Table 3.4-3 (see Section 3.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), the net change in emissions from the existing scenario to the Proposed Project is estimated to be 92,724 MT CO_{2e} per year. Given, the Proposed Project's GHG emissions are exceedingly over the SCAQMD threshold of 3,000 MT CO_{2e} per year, it is likely that Alternative 2 would also result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to GHG emissions. Therefore, the overall GHG emissions impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to the Proposed Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be reduced under Alternative 2 when compared to the Proposed Project due to the reduction in overall development and duration of construction activities. However, as with the Proposed Project, future redevelopment under Alternative 2 has the potential to encounter contaminated soils during grading activities and/or the potential release of asbestos-containing materials and lead based paint during demolition. Any remediation and or demolition would be required to comply with the appropriate standards and guidelines of the responsible agency. Nonetheless, under Alternative 2 and the Proposed Project, potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be significant without mitigation. Thus, both Alternative 2 and the Proposed Project would require mitigation. Impacts under Alternative 2 would be, as is the case

with the Proposed Project, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, impacts under Alternative 2 are similar to the Proposed Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Redevelopment under Alternative 2 could alter existing drainage patterns and the amount of runoff coming from the Plan Area. Short-term construction and long-term operational water quality impacts would be similar to the Proposed Project and would similarly be required to comply with the Construction General Permit and the City's MS4 Permit. Under Alternative 2 and the Proposed Project, an infrastructure plan would guide drainage improvement plans for the Plan Area. Although both Alternative 2 and the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation, Alternative 2 would result in fewer alterations to the existing drainage patterns within the Plan Area due to the reduction in overall development area. Therefore, the overall impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than the Proposed Project. ***Land Use and Planning***

Under Alternative 2, implementation of the GCSP would occur, but with a reduction in the overall development potential. Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative 2 would require a Zoning Code Amendment. Most notably, Alternative 2 would result in employment growth less than the horizon year jobs projected by SCAG, therefore, contributing to the job-poor status of the City of Long Beach. Alternative 2 would also fall short of the job generation goals of the 2019 General Plan Land Use Element. The jobs-poor status of the City could thereby result in increased vehicle commuting due to residents traveling out of the City for employment. Due to the significant job loss that resulted in the area from closure of the C-17 Site, which is evident by the number of manufacturing jobs lost from 2010 to 2016, the new jobs created by the GCSP would likely be replacing those that were lost in the area due to closure of the C-17 site. The Project's estimated 7,880 additional jobs would be consistent with SCAG's employment forecasts for the City. Alternative 2 would fall short of the job generation goals of the Land Use Element and SCAG plans, as compared to the Proposed Project.

Alternative 2 would implement a number of beneficial elements that would also occur under the Proposed Project, including enhancements to the Cherry Avenue corridor, design guidelines promoting quality design, complete street networks, and development in accordance with a unified specific plan. With the reduction in overall buildout potential, impacts would be less than significant under Alternative 2, but this alternative would be inconsistent with SCAG and 2019 General Plan policies regard in job generation in the City of Long Beach. Therefore, impacts related to consistency with the City of Long Beach General Plan and SCAG plans would be generally worse under Alternative 2, as compared to the Proposed Project.

Noise

Under Alternative 2, construction and operational noise impacts would be reduced because of the reduction in overall development potential. Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative 2 would have potentially significant construction and operational noise impacts without the incorporation of mitigation. Nonetheless, the overall reduction in building construction would reduce the length of potential construction under Alternative 2. Additionally, the reduction in square footage would reduce off-site traffic noise impacts, and on-site operational noise impacts. Therefore, the overall noise impacts under Alternative 2 would be less when compared to the Proposed Project.

Population and Housing

Alternative 2 would reduce the development potential from 8,906,403 square feet to 5,245,331 square feet. As such, Alternative 2 would result in fewer employees at full build out of the Plan Area as compared to the Proposed Project. Similarly, as with the Proposed Project, Alternative 2 would likely result in population and employment growth less than the horizon year jobs projected by SCAG. Alternative 2 would fall short of the job generation goals of the 2019 General Plan Land Use Element and SCAG plan projections for the horizon year, therefore, resulting in increased vehicle commuting due to the job-poor status of City of Long Beach. As with the Proposed Project, impacts would be less than significant under Alternative 2, but this alternative would be inconsistent with SCAG policies regard in jobs ratio goals for the City of Long Beach. Therefore, impacts related to the job-poor status of the City of Long Beach would be worse under Alternative 2, as compared to the Proposed Project.

Public Services

Under Alternative 2, the development potential would be reduced from 8,906,403 square feet to 5,245,331 square feet. Similarly, as with the Proposed Project, an increase in development intensity, as permitted, would result in an increase in fire and police protection services. However, as with the Proposed Project, impacts would be less than significant. Nonetheless, given that the Plan Area is largely built out, it is unlikely that redevelopment would increase the demand for public services. Therefore, the overall impacts to public services under Alternative 2 would be similar when compared to the Proposed Project.

Transportation

The Proposed Project would set forth a Mobility Plan to allow for the bicycle improvements called out in the Mobility Element. Under Alternative 2, land use designations would facilitate the bike improvements proposed in the Bicycle Master Plan, and thus, would reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), as would occur under the Proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative 2 would facilitate these multimodal infrastructure improvements, buildout of the specific plan area under existing zoning

would not provide bicycle and pedestrian facilities aimed at reducing VMT, as contemplated in the 2019 General Plan Land Use Element.

As further discussed in Section 3.11, Transportation, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS, compared to the Proposed Project, the buildout projections under Alternative 2 is approximately 54% less. As such, Alternative 2 would represent a significant decrease compared to the Proposed Project's peak hour trips compared to the existing condition. Although Alternative 2 would be less impactful at the key study intersections, additional trips would be added to the transportation system that could result in the similar degradation of level of service (LOS) at intersections in the Plan Area. While less trips would be added under Alternative 2, this reduced project would substantially increase the number of trips in the Plan Area compared to existing conditions. Existing intersection conditions would approach or exceed the maximum capacity under Alternative 2, similar to the Proposed Project.

Alternative 2 would result in fewer non-residential land uses. Therefore, VMT per existing resident in the City would likely be greater due to the need to commute further for jobs. Therefore, impacts related to the VMT of the City of Long Beach would be worse under Alternative 2, as compared to the Proposed Project. Overall impacts to LOS in the plan area under Alternative 2 would be similar than those identified under the Proposed Project.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Construction activities under Alternative 2 would be reduced from those created by the Proposed Project, due to the decrease in overall new construction area. The development potential would be reduced from 8,906,403 square feet to 5,245,331 square feet. However, as with the Proposed Project, development under Alternative 2 could result in an impact on known and/or unknown tribal cultural resources. Under Alternative 2 and the Proposed Project, potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would be significant without mitigation. As such, the tribal cultural resource impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to those created by the Proposed Project, and would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, the overall tribal cultural resource impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to the Proposed Project.

Utilities and Service Systems

Under Alternative 2, impacts on utilities and service systems would be reduced when compared to the Proposed Project, due to the decrease in overall development potential. The reduction in development would result in a decreased demand in water, natural gas, and electricity supply, as well as decreased generation of wastewater and solid waste in the overall Plan Area. Therefore, utilities and service systems impacts under Alternative 2 would be less when compared to the Proposed Project.

Environmental Justice

Under Alternative 2, the development potential would be reduced from 8,906,403 square feet to 5,245,331 square feet. As discussed in Section 3.14, Environmental Justice, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS, the neighborhood adjacent to the Plan Area is not considered a minority or low-income population. As is the case with the Proposed Project, any environmental impacts resulting from redevelopment would not disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations under Alternative 2. Therefore, the overall impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to the Proposed Project, and as such, would be less than significant.

Comparison of Environmental Impacts

Under Alternative 2, the density and intensity of development would be reduced. Given less redevelopment would occur, Alternative 2 would result in reduced impacts associated with hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation, and utilities and service systems. Nonetheless, Alternative 2 would result in the construction of new land uses and implement similar design guidelines, and thus, impacts would be similar in regards to aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, population and housing, public services, tribal cultural resources, and environmental justice.

4.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE/ PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

4.4.1 Environmentally Superior Alternative

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative; and, where the no project alternative is environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify an alternative from among the others evaluated as environmentally superior (14 CCR 15126.6(e)(2)). NEPA also requires that in cases where an EIS is prepared, the Record of Decision must specify the alternative or alternatives which were found to be environmentally preferable to the biological and physical environment and that will promote the national environmental policy as expressed in NEPA’s Section 101 (40 CFR 1505.2(b)). In this document, the term “environmentally superior” is used to satisfy both CEQA and NEPA requirements.

With respect to identifying an Environmentally Superior Alternative among those analyzed in this PEIR/PEIS, the range of feasible Alternatives includes: Alternative 1, No Project Alternative and Alternative 2, Reduced Project Alternative. A comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with each alternative is provided in Table 4-2, Comparison of Impacts.

As shown, Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, would be the environmentally superior alternative, as it would result in no new environmental impacts and would avoid the Proposed Project’s significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, GHG emissions, and transportation/traffic. Although the No Project Alternative would result in a greater number of reduced environmental impacts, Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that if the environmentally superior alternative is the no project alternative, the EIR shall also identify another environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The remaining alternative, Alternative 2, was reviewed in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines requirements. Alternative 2 would lessen the significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, GHG emissions, and transportation; however, impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, and GHG emissions, and transportation would remain significant and unavoidable. Additionally, Alternative 1, would not result in the creation of a planning and regulatory framework, to address economic impacts of the C-17 site closure, and thus, would not fulfill the purpose and need for the Proposed Project. Additionally, none of Proposed Project objectives would be achieved under Alternative 1. Comparatively, Alternative 2 would implement a strategic framework to address the economic impacts associated with the C-17 Site closure, and thus, would fulfill the purpose and need for the Proposed Project. Additionally, Alternative 2 would help meet most of the objectives identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, the environmentally superior alternative is Alternative 2.

**Table 4-2
Comparison of Impacts**

Impact Area	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 (No Project)	Alternative 2
Aesthetics	Less than significant	Greater	Similar
Air Quality	Significant and unavoidable	Less	Similar
Cultural Resources	Significant and unavoidable	Less	Similar
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Significant and unavoidable	Less	Similar
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less than significant with mitigation	Similar	Less
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less than significant	Greater	Less
Land Use and Planning	Less than significant	Greater	Similar
Noise	Less than significant with mitigation	Less	Less
Population and Housing	Less than significant	Similar	Similar
Public Services	Less than significant	Similar	Similar
Transportation	Significant and unavoidable	Less	Similar
Tribal Cultural Resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Similar	Similar
Utilities and Service Systems	Less than significant	Similar	Similar
Environmental Justice	Less than significant	Similar	Similar

Bold for environmental resource categories where the Proposed Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact following implementation of all feasible mitigation.

4.4.2 Preferred Alternative

Under NEPA implementing regulation 40 CFR Section 1502.14(e), the lead agency is required to identify the agency’s preferred alternative in the Draft EIS if a preferred alternative is known at the time of the Draft EIS. Pending public comment on the Draft PEIR/PEIS, the City’s preferred alternative at the time of the Draft PEIS is the Proposed Project. The identification of a preferred alternative does not constitute a commitment or decision, and there is no requirement to select the preferred alternative in the record of decision. The identification of the preferred alternative may change between a Draft PEIR/PEIS and Final PEIR/PEIS. Various parts of separate alternatives that are analyzed in the draft can also be “mixed and matched” to develop a complete alternative in the Final EIS as long as the reasons for doing so are explained. Selection in the record of decision of an alternative other than the preferred alternative does not require preparation of a supplemental EIS.