

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 Purpose and Scope

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an environmental impact report (EIR) include a discussion of reasonable project alternatives that would “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6[a]). As required by CEQA, this chapter identifies and evaluates potential alternatives to the Century Villages at Cabrillo Specific Plan (Specific Plan).

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines explains the foundation and legal requirements for the alternatives’ analysis in an EIR. Key provisions are:

- “[T]he discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.” (15126.6[b])
- “The specific alternative of ‘no project’ shall also be evaluated along with its impact.” (15126.6[e][1])
- “The no project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, 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. If the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘no project’ alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” (15126.6[e][2])
- “The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a ‘rule of reason’ that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.” (15126.6[f])
- “Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries..., and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent)” (15126.6[f][1]).
- “Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.” (15126.6[f][2][A])

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

- “An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.” (15126.6[f][3])

For each development alternative, this analysis:

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

According to Section 15126.6(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, “[i]f an alternative would cause...significant effects in addition 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.”

7.1.2 Project Objectives

As described in Section 3.2, *Project Objectives*, of Chapter 3, *Project Description*, the following objectives have been established for the Specific Plan and will aid decision makers in their review of the project, the project alternatives, and associated environmental impacts.

1. Integrate both new and rehabilitated residential development for the express purpose of providing transitional housing and support services to homeless veterans and the homeless population of the region.
2. Allow for the long-term development and enhancement of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community to anchor residents, meet the evolving needs of the community and provide necessary support of resident’s mental, physical, and emotional health.
3. Enhance the safety, livability, and connectivity of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community.
4. Guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land in order to accommodate increased demand for housing and services, while increasing energy efficiency.
5. Develop enhanced and expanded open space and connectivity throughout the community to serve the needs of residents and employees.
6. Provide housings and services near the West Long Beach Transit Center and within a transit priority area consistent with Statewide and regional goals to reduce vehicle miles traveled.
7. Enhance the continued fiscal health, viability, and success of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

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

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

7.2.1 Alternative Development Areas

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project. The key question and first step in the analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR (CEQA Guidelines § 15126[5][B][1]). In addition, an alternative site need not be considered when implementation is “remote and speculative,” such as when the alternative site is beyond the control of a project applicant.

In general, any development of the size and type proposed by the Project would have substantially the same impacts on air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems. Since the City is highly urbanized, impacts to traffic would also occur in other areas of the City. On the other hand, without a site-specific analysis, impacts on aesthetics, biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and mineral resources cannot be evaluated. However, these impacts were found to be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation incorporated for the Project. Therefore, another location would not avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects of the proposed Project.

As discussed in the Century Villages at Cabrillo Specific Plan, the Project area encompasses the entirety of the 27-acre Villages at Cabrillo, an established residential community intended to break the cycle of homelessness. Redevelopment of the site pursuant to the Project Applicant’s mission would provide quality dwelling units for residents in need, while hosting modern spaces for current and new social service providers, commercial uses, community amenities. Redevelopment of underutilized properties with new modern buildings meeting the most recent code requirements reduces impacts on the environment by reducing operational air quality and greenhouse gas emissions and connecting to existing available infrastructure.

Residents, the property owner, and the City have long recognized the importance of this area to the City and emphasized the need for thoughtful long-term planning. The purpose of the Specific Plan is to provide a regulatory framework that is tailored specific for this area. It includes customized land uses and development standards, design guidelines, and provides enhanced pedestrian connections and multimodal transportation choices. The Specific Plan is suited particularly for the Project area, placing this Specific Plan or ultimate development in another area of the City is not feasible, nor does the Project Applicant have ownership or control of another similar sized property that could accommodate the proposed development. Therefore, considering another site would be too remote and speculative.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.2.2 Project Under Existing Zoning

The Project Under Existing Zoning Alternative would consider the development of the Project site with uses that conform to the existing zoning standards for the Plan Area, which is Subarea D of PD-31. The subarea is intended to promote the adaptive reuse of the existing housing and support facility buildings to provide transitional housing and support services to homeless veterans and the homeless population in the City. However, under existing conditions, the Plan Area is generally built out. Under this alternative, the total residential units and non-residential square footage would be similar to existing conditions, which has been analyzed below under the “No Project/No Development Alternative.” Therefore, this alternative has not been analyzed further.

7.2.3 Other Alternatives to Reduce Construction-Related Impacts

The Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality and noise during construction. Although construction activities would result in significant impacts for air quality emissions and noise, these impacts are temporary in nature and primarily resulting from the fact that 1) this Project is an infill development with close proximity to on site sensitive receptors and 2) the construction time frames and equipment for individual site-specific projects and potential overlap of activities at any one time is not available. The DEIR also analyzed the worst-case potential conditions. Furthermore, because existing sensitive receptors may be close to project-related construction activities, construction emissions generated by individual development projects have the potential to exceed South Coast AQMD’s project-specific LSTs and health risk thresholds. Again, the DEIR was based on the most conservative construction scenario and conservatively determined that it is not possible to determine whether individual development projects would result in the exceedance of the localized emissions thresholds and contribute to known health effects, due to the scale of development activities. Any redevelopment and associated construction activities that would occur within a community of this size, scale, and building orientation would have similar construction-related impacts due to the proximity of on-site sensitive receptors. Therefore, because implementation of the Specific Plan involves redevelopment of an infill site and construction activities near existing on-campus residents, other alternatives, such as alternative land uses or a substantial reduction in the size of the project, would result in similar construction-related impacts to air quality and noise.

With respect to construction-related noise impacts, demolition and construction activities are proposed to adjacent to residential buildings. Although all feasible mitigation measures were incorporated, due to the limited attenuation that can be provided through mitigation, specifically to upper-level dwelling units of multi-story residential buildings, any redevelopment project would result in significant impacts to adjacent residential buildings. Furthermore, due to the nature of infill development and the proximity of any new redevelopment to existing structures, strict adherence to the screening distances is not possible in all cases. Eliminating construction-related noise impacts by vacating the property until construction is complete is not feasible.

Over long-term buildout, implementation of the Specific Plan would replace and rehabilitate outdated buildings with new modern facilities that would comply with the latest CBC and CalGreen standards, while increasing long term energy efficiency and reducing noise impacts. Therefore, other alternatives to reduce construction-related air quality and noise impacts, except as indicated below, have not been analyzed further.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.3 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

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

- No Project/No Development Alternative
- Reduced Intensity Alternative

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative and where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated. Each alternative's environmental impacts are compared to the Specific Plan and determined to be environmentally superior, neutral, or inferior. However, only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are used in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the Specific Plan. Impacts found to be significant and unavoidable include air quality (construction), greenhouse gas emissions, and noise (construction) (see Chapter 6, *Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts*, of this DEIR). Section 7.5 identifies the environmentally superior alternative.

7.3.1 Alternatives Comparison

Table 7-1, *Building Statistical Summary*, provides a comparison of buildout projections determined by the land use alternatives, including the Specific Plan. Table 7-1 identifies information regarding dwelling unit, population, nonresidential square feet, and employment for each of the alternatives.

Table 7-1 Net New Development Statistical Summary

	Specific Plan	No Project/No Development Alternative	Reduced Intensity Alternative ¹
Net New Dwelling Units	515	0	464
Net New Population	1,442	0	1,298
Nonresidential Square Feet			
Amenities	66,970	12,380	60,273
Education	4,800	10,200	4,320
Commercial/Retail	17,000	5,850	15,300
Services/Administration	40,750	26,300	36,675
New Employment	267	-	240

Note: Refer to Section 5.11, Population Housing, of this DEIR, for the assumptions and calculations used to determine population and employment.

1. The Reduced Intensity Alternative is the reduction of the proposed net new development intensity by 10 percent.

7.4 NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires analysis of the No Project/No Development Alternative. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project/No Development Alternative for a development project on an identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which the project does not proceed as

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

provided by Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) provides that, “In certain instances, the no project alternative means ‘no build’ wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained.”

The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes the Specific Plan would not be adopted or implemented. It also assumes that no new development would occur and the Plan Area would remain in its existing condition and be considered built out. Therefore, all existing land uses, improvements, and services would remain with no additional development in the future. Some minor population growth could occur within the Plan Area, to the extent that existing residential units could accommodate additional residents (e.g., a decrease in vacancy rates). The existing development consists of 865 residential dwelling units and 54,730 non-residential square feet. None of the impacts of the Specific Plan, adverse or beneficial, would result under this alternative.

7.4.1 Aesthetics

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no new development would occur in the Plan Area and all existing land uses, improvements, and services would remain. The existing visual character and resources would remain as is—the residential and nonresidential uses that would occur under the Specific Plan would not be developed. However, the various visual improvements that would be introduced throughout the Plan Area under the Specific Plan (e.g., new and rehabilitated buildings and site improvements, new landscaping and open space, building form and architectural design) also would not occur under this alternative. In contrast to this alternative, the Specific Plan is intended to integrate both new and rehabilitated residential development (Objective 1), guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land (Objective 4), and develop enhanced and expanded open space and connectivity throughout the community (Objective 5). Additionally, the Specific Plan’s aesthetic and visual resource impacts were determined to be less than significant. Aesthetic impacts under this alternative would be greater compared to the Specific Plan, but still would be less than significant.

7.4.2 Air Quality

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no new development or construction and demolition activities (and related air quality emissions) would occur. Therefore, the Specific Plan’s significant and unavoidable construction-related emissions impact would be eliminated under this alternative. Additionally, since this alternative would not result in increased traffic, associated air emissions would remain as is and less than the Specific Plan. Therefore, traffic-related operational air emissions would be reduced. Additionally, unlike the Specific Plan, this alternative would not integrate both new and rehabilitated residential development (Objective 1), allow for the long-term development and enhancement of the Plan Area (Objective 2), and guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land (Objective 4). However, the Specific Plan’s operational-related air quality impacts were determined to be less than significant. Overall, air quality impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the Specific Plan, and would be less than significant.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.4.3 Cultural Resources

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no new development would occur in the Plan Area; therefore, this alternative would not result in the potential to encounter unknown subsurface archaeological resources that may exist beneath the ground surface during ground-disturbing activities. Additionally, unlike the Specific Plan, this alternative would not integrate both new and rehabilitated residential development (Objective 1), allow for the long-term development and enhancement of the Plan Area (Objective 2), and guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land (Objective 4). However, the Specific Plan's cultural resource impacts (both archeological and historical) were determined to be less than significant. Overall, cultural resource impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the Specific Plan, and would be less than significant.

7.4.4 Energy

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in the generation of a temporary increase in energy and fuel use during construction activities and would not generate a long-term increase in energy and fuel use during project operation due to the increase in intensity. Additionally, unlike the Specific Plan, this alternative would not guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land while increasing energy efficiency (Objective 4). However, the Specific Plan's energy impacts (both construction and operational) were determined to be less than significant. Overall, energy impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the Specific Plan, and would be less than significant.

7.4.5 Geology and Soils

No new construction activities, including demolition and grading, would occur under the No Project/No Development Alternative. Therefore, there would be no potential for additional residents, workers, buildings, and structures to experience seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, subsidence, or expansion throughout the Plan Area. Additionally, this alternative would not result in the potential to encounter unknown subsurface paleontological resources that may exist beneath the ground surface during ground-disturbing activities. However, many buildings throughout the Plan Area were built before current seismic safety codes; therefore, this alternative, by retaining older buildings, could expose people to greater hazards from strong ground shaking. Additionally, the Specific Plan's impacts to geology and soils (seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, subsidence, or expansion) were determined to be less than significant. Furthermore, the Specific Plan's impacts to paleontological resources were determined to be less than significant with implementation of mitigation. Overall, geology and soils impacts of this alternative would be similar to those of the Specific Plan, and would be less than significant.

7.4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes the Plan Area is built out and no new development would occur. While implementation of the Specific Plan would further options for alternative modes of travel through the creation of pedestrian, bicycle and public transit improvements and services by adding a greater mix of uses, it would also allow for greater development that would generate greater amounts of GHG

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

emissions than existing conditions. This alternative would result in a reduction of GHG emissions, and the Specific Plan's significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact would be eliminated. Additionally, unlike the Specific Plan, this alternative would not guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land while increasing energy efficiency (Objective 4). Overall, impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the Specific Plan, and would be less than significant.

7.4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, the Plan Area is assumed to be built out and no new development would occur. There would be no new potential to expose the public to hazardous materials through routine transport and use or through a possible accident due to release of hazardous materials that could occur during the construction and operational phases of the development accommodated by the Specific Plan. Additionally, the potential for asbestos-containing materials and lead based paint to be released during the demolition of building and structures under the Specific Plan would not occur, as no new development would occur under this alternative. However, the Specific Plan's impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials were determined to be less than significant. Additionally, unlike the Specific Plan, this alternative would not integrate both new and rehabilitated residential development (Objective 1), allow for the long-term development and enhancement of the Plan Area (Objective 2), and guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land (Objective 4). Overall, impacts of this alternative would be reduced compared to the Specific Plan, and would be less than significant.

7.4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

Existing water quality conditions, groundwater supplies, drainage patterns, and runoff water amounts would remain as is under this alternative as no new development would occur. This alternative would not introduce new sources of water pollutants (from either construction or operations phases of development projects) to the Plan Area. Additionally, this alternative would not require the storm drain facility improvements that would be required under the Specific Plan. However, this alternative would not include the development of new low-impact development (LID), source control, site design, and treatment control best management practices (BMPs) to minimize runoff and water pollutants, which would occur under the Specific Plan. These required measures have a beneficial impact on stormwater quality. Additionally, the Specific Plan's impacts related to hydrology and water quality were determined to be less than significant. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts would be slightly greater under this alternative compared to the Specific Plan, but would remain less than significant.

7.4.9 Land Use and Planning

Given that the Specific Plan would not be adopted, this alternative would not require an amendment to the Long Beach Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map. The existing Regional Serving Facility (RSF) place type of the Plan Area would remain and no new development would occur. However, unlike the Specific Plan this alternative would not integrate both new and rehabilitated residential development (Objective 1), allow for the enhancement of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community (Objective 2), guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land (Objective 4), or develop enhanced and expanded open space and

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

connectivity throughout the community (Objective 5). New development standards and design guidelines to enhance the character, mobility, and streetscape of the Plan Area would also not be implemented. Furthermore, the Specific Plan's impacts to land use and planning were determined to be less than significant. Overall, land use impacts of this alternative would be similar to those of the Specific Plan, and would be less than significant.

7.4.10 Noise

Under this alternative no new development would occur. Therefore, this alternative would eliminate the Specific Plan's significant and unavoidable construction-related noise impacts related. Additionally, no new operational noise (mobile or stationary) would be generated given that no development would occur under this alternative. Additionally, unlike the Specific Plan, this alternative would not integrate both new and rehabilitated residential development (Objective 1), allow for the long-term development and enhancement of the Plan Area (Objective 2), and guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land (Objective 4). Overall, impacts would be reduced under this alternative compared to the Specific Plan, and would be less than significant.

7.4.11 Population and Housing

Population growth would not occur under the No Project/No Development Alternative because no new residential units would be proposed. However, the Specific Plan's impacts to population and housing were determined to be less than significant. Additionally, unlike the Specific Plan this alternative would not include the integration of both new and rehabilitated residential development (Objective 1) and the long-term development and enhancement of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community (Objective 2). Therefore, this alternative would leave out much needed opportunities for additional housing and services for both the Century Villages at Cabrillo community and the homeless population of the Long Beach metropolitan area. Overall, population and housing impacts would be greater under this alternative compared to the Specific Plan, but would remain less than significant.

7.4.12 Public Services

Existing housing, population, nonresidential uses (education, commercial/retail, and service/administration) and workers in the Plan Area would remain under this alternative. There would be no increase in demand for fire protection, police protection, schools, or libraries. However, the Specific Plan's impacts to public services were determined to be less than significant. Overall, public services impacts would be reduced under this alternative compared to the Specific Plan, and would be less than significant.

7.4.13 Recreation

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no new residents or employees would be introduced to the Plan Area, which would reduce impacts resulting from additional demand on parks and recreational facilities in the City. However, the Specific Plan's impacts on parks and recreational facilities were determined to be less than significant. Additionally, unlike the Specific Plan, this alternative would not enhance the livability and connectivity of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community (Objective 3) or develop enhanced and expanded open space and connectivity throughout the community (Objective 5). Overall, impacts to parks and

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

recreational facilities would be slightly greater under this alternative compared to the proposed Project, but would remain less than significant.

7.4.14 Transportation

Under this alternative, no new housing units, residents, employees, or nonresidential uses (education, commercial/retail, and service/administration) would be introduced into the Plan Area. The increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) that would occur under the Specific Plan would not occur under this alternative. However, the Specific Plan's transportation impacts related to VMT were determined to be less than significant. Additionally, unlike the Specific Plan, this alternative would not enhance the livability and connectivity of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community (Objective 3). Overall, impacts would be reduced under this alternative compared to the Specific Plan, and would be less than significant.

7.4.15 Tribal Cultural Resources

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no new development would occur in the Plan Area; therefore, this alternative would not result in the potential to encounter unknown subsurface tribal cultural resources that may exist beneath the ground surface during ground-disturbing activities. However, the Specific Plan's tribal cultural resource impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Additionally, unlike the Specific Plan, this alternative would not integrate both new and rehabilitated residential development (Objective 1), allow for the long-term development and enhancement of the Plan Area (Objective 2), and guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land (Objective 4). Overall, cultural resource impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the Specific Plan, and would be less than significant.

7.4.16 Utilities and Service Systems

No new development and population or employment increase under this alternative would mean that existing water supply demand in the Plan Area would remain the same; wastewater and solid waste generation would also remain the same. In comparison, the Specific Plan would introduce new housing units, residents, employees, or nonresidential uses, which would result in an increase water demands and wastewater and solid waste generation. However, the Specific Plan's impacts on utilities and service systems were determined to be less than significant. Additionally, unlike the Specific Plan, this alternative would not integrate both new and rehabilitated residential development (Objective 1), allow for the long-term development and enhancement of the Plan Area (Objective 2), and guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land (Objective 4). Overall, impacts to utilities and service system would be reduced under this alternative compared to the Specific Plan, and would be less than significant.

7.4.17 Conclusion

7.4.17.1 ABILITY TO REDUCE IMPACTS

The No Project/No Development Alternative would eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality (construction), GHG emissions, and noise (construction) that would occur from implementation

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

of the Specific Plan. This alternative would also reduce impacts related to air quality (operational), cultural resources, energy, hazards and hazardous materials, noise (operational), public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems. Impacts related to aesthetics, hydrology and water quality, population and housing, and recreation would be greater under this alternative; impacts to geology and soils and land use and planning would be similar compared to the Specific Plan.

7.4.17.2 ABILITY TO ACHIEVE PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative means that no new development would occur in the Plan Area, and all but one of the project objectives (Objective 6, “Provide housing and services near the West Long Beach Transit Center and within a transit priority area consistent with Statewide and regional goals to reduce vehicle miles traveled”) would not be achieved under this alternative. This alternative would not integrate both new and rehabilitated residential development for transitional housing and support services to homeless veterans and the homeless population of the Long Beach metropolitan area (Objective 1); allow for the long-term development and enhancement of the community (Objective 2); enhance the safety, livability, and connectivity of the community (Objective 3); guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land (Objective 4); develop enhanced and expanded open space and connectivity throughout the community (Objective 5); or enhance the continued fiscal health, viability, and success of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community (Objective 7).

7.5 REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Intensity Alternative was analyzed to reduce environmental impacts related to air quality, GHG emissions, and noise. To accomplish the reduction, this alternative would reduce the proposed net new development intensity by 10 percent. As shown in Table 7-1, this alternative would result in a net increase of 464 dwelling units and 116,568 square feet of nonresidential uses (amenities, education, commercial/retail, and service/administration). The development area under this alternative would be the same as with the Specific Plan, 27 acres. Like the Project, this alternative would require adoption of the Specific Plan.

7.5.1 Aesthetics

Under this alternative, the intensity of proposed net new development would be reduced by 10 percent resulting in less building construction and other site improvements. Given that less development would occur, this alternative would result in less change to the existing visual character and contribute fewer new sources of light and glare to the Plan Area. However, impacts associated with the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be similar to the Specific Plan because it would result in a similar development area and would require compliance with the provisions of the Specific Plan. Although buildout intensity would be reduced, heights, setbacks, building forms, and other development standards and design guidelines would still apply. Aesthetics impacts under this alternative would be less than significant. Furthermore, this alternative could meet Objective 4 relating to redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land and Objective 5 relating to development of enhanced and expanded open space, but to a lesser extent than the Specific Plan. Therefore, impacts of this alternative would be similar to the Specific Plan.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.5.2 Air Quality

This alternative would result in a decrease in housing units, residents, employees, and nonresidential uses in the Plan Area, thereby also decreasing construction and operation emissions compared to the Specific Plan. Operation-related criteria air pollutant generated from stationary and mobile sources would decrease due to the reduced intensity of this alternative. Additionally, as with the Specific Plan, operational-related air quality impacts under this alternative would be less than significant. However, there is still the potential for multiple developments to be constructed at any one time; therefore, as with the Specific Plan, significant and unavoidable construction-related emissions would still occur under this alternative. Furthermore, this alternative could meet all objectives, but to a lesser extent than the Specific Plan. Overall, impacts to air quality under this alternative would slightly decrease compared to the Specific Plan.

7.5.3 Cultural Resources

Compared to the Specific Plan, the amount of development intensity would decrease under this alternative. However, this alternative would impact a similar development area that would be impacted under the Specific Plan. Additionally, as with the Specific Plan, cultural resources impacts (archeological and historic) under this alternative would be less than significant. Therefore, cultural resources impacts under this alternative would be similar to those of the Specific Plan.

7.5.4 Energy

This alternative would result in a reduction in building energy compared to the Specific Plan, as well as fewer vehicle trips and associated fuel use. In addition, the reduction in building square footage would not require as much electricity and natural gas for building cooling and heating needs; therefore, this Alternative would reduce energy demands. During construction, the reduction in building square footage would also require slightly less fuel as the vertical and/or horizontal building construction phase would be shortened. Additionally, as with the Specific Plan, energy impacts under this alternative would be less than significant. Furthermore, this alternative could meet Objective 4 relating to redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land while increasing energy efficiency, but to a lesser extent than the Specific Plan. Overall, impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the Specific Plan.

7.5.5 Geology and Soils

Geology and soils impacts related to seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, subsidence, and soil expansion would be similar to those that would occur under the Specific Plan because the impacted development area would be similar under this alternative. This alternative would impact the same development area that would be impacted under the Specific Plan; therefore, the potential of impacting unknown subsurface paleontological resources remains the same. As with the Specific Plan, paleontological resources impacts under this alternative would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation. Overall, geology and soils impacts under this alternative would be similar.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.5.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a decrease in housing units, residents, employees, and nonresidential uses in the Plan Area, thereby also decreasing construction and operation GHG emissions compared to the Specific Plan. A proportional 10 percent decrease in GHG emissions would reduce emissions just below SCAG's 3,000 MT CO_{2e} threshold, and impacts would be less than significant. It should be noted that the GHG emissions associated with Specific Plan implementation resulted in a slight increase over the 3,000 MT CO_{2e} threshold. The Specific Plan incorporates all feasible mitigation measures to reduce GHG impacts. Mitigation Measures GHG-1 and GHG-2 require new development to be either certified LEED Silver Level or comply with the voluntary measures of CALGreen and install Energy Star certified appliances in residential projects. Additionally, the Specific Plan includes transportation demand management (TDM) measures to further reduce parking demand and VMT, such as employee flexible work programs, subsidized transit passes, and carpool/carshare programs. However, because the number of people who may use alternative modes of transportation is uncertain, the total reductions cannot be quantified. The lead agency (City of Long Beach) cannot substantively or materially affect reductions in project mobile-source emissions beyond the regulatory requirements, which is the main source of GHG emissions for the Specific Plan. Therefore, although this alternative could demonstrate achieving a reduction in GHG emissions below the significance threshold, the DEIR used a conservative approach in measuring GHG emission impacts. Furthermore, this alternative could meet Objective 4 relating to redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land while increasing energy efficiency, but to a lesser extent than the Specific Plan. Therefore, this alternative would eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact.

7.5.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Similar to the Specific Plan, buildout of the Reduced Intensity Alternative could result in the potential to expose the public to hazardous materials through routine use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials or through a possible accident due to release of hazardous materials that could occur during the construction and operational phases of the development that would be accommodated by this alternative. Additionally, there is the potential for asbestos-containing materials and lead based paint to be released during the demolition of building and structures under this alternative. However, similar to the proposed Project, new development is not expected to involve the use of large amounts of hazardous materials. Hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials during operation of this alternative would not occur. Additionally, any demolition activities and the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials would be required to comply with the appropriate state and local standards, guidelines, and requirements of responsible agencies (e.g., DTSC, RWQCB, LBFD). As such, impacts related to hazards for this alternative would be less than significant with mitigation. Overall, impacts would be similar under this alternative compared to the Specific Plan.

7.5.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, there would be a reduction in new development, which would result in a slight reduction in impervious surfaces. Additionally, as with the Specific Plan, this alternative would introduce new sources of water pollutants (from either construction or operations phases of development

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

projects) to the Plan Area, as new development would occur. This alternative would also require the storm drain facility improvements that would be required under the Specific Plan. This alternative would also include the development of new low-impact development (LID), source control, site design, and treatment control best management practices (BMPs) to minimize runoff and water pollutants. As with the Specific Plan, compliance with water quality regulations would reduce water quality impacts to less than significant. Furthermore, this alternative could meet all objectives, but to a lesser extent than the Specific Plan. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts would be slightly reduced under this alternative compared to the Specific Plan.

7.5.9 Land Use and Planning

Similar to the Specific Plan, this alternative would require an amendment to the Long Beach Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map and adoption of the Specific Plan. However, development of the Plan Area would occur in accordance with the provisions of the Specific Plan, which would serve as the regulatory zoning document for the Plan Area. New development standards and design guidelines to enhance the character, mobility, and streetscape of the Plan Area would also be implemented under this alternative. This alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to land use and planning. Overall, land use impacts of this alternative would be similar to those of the Specific Plan.

7.5.10 Noise

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would involve the same general phases of construction as the Project (i.e., demolition, site grading, building construction, and finishing/landscape installation) and cover the same general development impact area. However, the building construction and finishing phases would be reduced under compared to the Project because of a 10 percent reduction in building square footage. As with the Project, construction of this alternative would generate noise from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment as well as from haul truck and construction worker trips. Due to the reduction in building size, the overall duration of construction would be reduced. Notwithstanding, on-site construction activities and the associated construction noise and vibration levels would be expected to be similar during maximum activity days since only the overall duration, and not the daily intensity of construction activities and associated equipment noise, would decrease under this alternative when compared to the Project. Noise and vibration levels during maximum activity days, which are used for measuring impact significance, would be similar to those of the Project and significant and unavoidable.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce daily vehicle trips compared to the Specific Plan. This would slightly decrease long-term noise impacts from vehicle sources. However, no significant long-term noise impacts were identified with the Specific Plan. Similar to the Project, vehicular-related noise impacts would be less than significant. Furthermore, this alternative could meet all objectives, but to a lesser extent than the Specific Plan. Overall, this alternative would result in a slight reduction of noise impacts.

7.5.11 Population and Housing

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, buildout would result in 27 fewer jobs and 52 fewer residents. Additionally, this alternative would provide fewer housing units and nonresidential uses (education,

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

commercial/retail, and service/administration) compared to the Specific Plan. However, under this alternative and similar to the Specific Plan, the population, housing, and employment at buildout would be consistent with the City's growth projections identified in SCAG's RTP/SCS. Overall, impacts to population and housing would remain less than significant with this alternative and similar to the proposed Project.

7.5.12 Public Services

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, residential and nonresidential development would be reduced by 10 percent. This would result in a corresponding reduction in demands placed on public services, including fire protection, law enforcement, schools, and library services. However, as with the Specific Plan impacts would be less than significant. Furthermore, this alternative could meet all objectives, but to a lesser extent than the Specific Plan. Overall, impacts under this alternative would be less than significant and would be reduced compared to the Specific Plan since there would be less residential and nonresidential development and fewer residents and employees at full buildout.

7.5.13 Recreation

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, the demands on existing recreational facilities would be reduced due to the reduction in overall population. Less parkland would be required to serve the projected population at buildout. Additionally, as with the Specific Plan, this alternative would enhance the livability and connectivity of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community (Goal 3) and develop enhanced and expanded open space and connectivity throughout the community (Objective 5), but to a slightly reduced extent. Overall, impacts to parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant and similar under this alternative compared to the proposed Project.

7.5.14 Transportation

Under this alternative, lesser new housing units, residents, employees, and nonresidential uses (education, commercial/retail, and service/administration) would be introduced into the Plan Area. Therefore, the increase in VMT that would occur under the Specific Plan would also occur under this alternative, but to a lesser extent. However, as with the Specific Plan, transportation impacts related to VMT under this alternative would be determined to be less than significant. Furthermore, this alternative could meet Objective 3 relating to enhance the livability and connectivity of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community, but to a lesser extent than the Specific Plan. Overall, impacts would be reduced under this alternative compared to the Specific Plan.

7.5.15 Tribal Cultural Resources

Compared to the Specific Plan, the amount of development intensity would decrease under this alternative. However, development under this alternative would impact the same development area that would be impacted under the Specific Plan. Additionally, as with the Specific Plan, tribal cultural resources impacts under this alternative would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, tribal cultural resources impacts under this alternative would be similar to those of the Specific Plan.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.5.16 Utilities and Service Systems

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, impacts to utilities and service systems would be reduced due to the reduction in residential and nonresidential intensity. This alternative would also reduce the generation of wastewater and solid waste and the need for potable water. Overall, impacts would be reduced under this alternative, and similar to the Specific Plan, would remain less than significant.

7.5.17 Conclusion

7.5.17.1 ABILITY TO REDUCE IMPACTS

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce (but not eliminate) significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality and noise compared to the Specific Plan. The Project's significant and unavoidable GHG impact would be eliminated under this alternative. Impacts related to aesthetics, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, and utilities and service systems would remain the same as or be slightly reduced compared to the Specific Plan, as demonstrated above, since it would involve the same mix of land uses (although at a reduced intensity) and development area. This alternative would not increase impacts for any environmental topical area.

7.5.17.2 ABILITY TO ACHIEVE PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative all of the Specific Plan's objectives would be achieved but the majority would be met to a lesser extent as compared to the Specific Plan. For example, the reduction in development capacity under this alternative would not fully implement the ideas and plans presented in the Specific Plan, which include the integration of both new and rehabilitated residential development (Objective 1) and the long-term development and enhancement of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community (Objective 2). Although the Reduced Intensity Alternative would meet these goals, it would do so at a reduced capacity; therefore, leaving out much needed opportunities for additional housing and services for both the Century Villages at Cabrillo community and the homeless population of the Long Beach metropolitan area. This alternative could also meet Objectives 4, 6 and 7 relating to redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land, provision of housings and services near public transit, and enhancement of the continued fiscal health, viability, and success of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community, but to a lesser extent than the Specific Plan. The goal that would be equally met by the Reduced Intensity Alternative is Objective 3, enhanced living and connectivity.

7.6 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires a lead agency to identify the "environmentally superior alternative" and, in cases where the "No Project" Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project, an environmentally superior development alternative must be identified. Table 7-2 summarizes the impacts for the alternatives and how they compare to the Specific Plan.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Table 7-2 Summary of Impacts of Alternatives Compared to the Specific Plan

Topic	Specific Plan	No Project/ No Development	Reduced Intensity
Aesthetics	LTS	(+)	(=)
Air Quality			
<i>Construction</i>	SU	(-)*	(-)
<i>Operation</i>	LTS	(-)	(-)
Cultural Resources	LTS	(-)	(=)
Energy	LTS	(-)	(-)
Geology and Soils	LTS	(-)	(=)
Paleontological Resources	LTS/M	(-)	(=)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	SU	(-)*	(-)*
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LTS/M	(-)	(=)
Hydrology and Water Quality	LTS	(+)	(-)
Land Use and Planning	LTS	(=)	(=)
Noise			
<i>Construction</i>	SU	(-)*	(-)
<i>Operation</i>	LTS	(-)	(-)
Population and Housing	LTS	(=)	(=)
Public Services	LTS	(-)	(-)
Recreation	LTS	(+)	(=)
Transportation	LTS	(-)	(-)
Tribal Cultural Resources	LTS/M	(-)	(=)
Utilities and Service Systems	LTS	(-)	(-)

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

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

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

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

* Indicates elimination of a significant and unavoidable impact.

The No Project/No Development Alternative is environmentally superior to the Specific Plan because it results in the elimination of the Specific Plan's three significant unavoidable adverse impacts: Air Quality (construction), GHG emissions, and Noise (construction). Since the environmentally superior alternative is a no project alternative, a development alternative was selected, as required by CEQA. One alternative has been identified as "environmentally superior" to the Specific Plan:

■ Reduced Intensity Alternative

The Reduced Intensity Alternative has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative. This alternative would reduce (but not eliminate) significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality, and noise compared to the Specific Plan. The Project's significant and unavoidable GHG impact would be eliminated under this alternative. Impacts related to aesthetics, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, and utilities and service systems would remain the same as or be slightly reduced compared to the Specific Plan, as demonstrated above, since this alternative would involve the same mix of land uses (although at a reduced intensity) and development area. This alternative would not increase impacts for any environmental topical area.

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

As demonstrated above and in Table 7-3, *Ability of Alternatives to Meet Project Objectives*, under the Reduced Intensity Alternative all of the Specific Plan’s objectives would be achieved but the majority would be met to a lesser extent as compared to the Specific Plan. For example, the reduction in development capacity under this alternative would not fully implement the ideas and plans presented in the Specific Plan, which include the integration of both new and rehabilitated residential development (Objective 1), the long-term development and enhancement of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community (Objective 2), and development of enhanced and expanded open space and connectivity throughout the community (Objective 5). Although the Reduced Intensity Alternative would meet these goals, it would do so at a reduced capacity; therefore, leaving out much needed opportunities for additional housing and services for both the Century Villages at Cabrillo community and the homeless population of the Long Beach metropolitan area. This alternative could also meet Objectives 4, 6 and 7 relating to redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land, provision of housings and services near public transit, and enhancement of the continued fiscal health, viability, and success of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community, but to a lesser extent than the Specific Plan. The goal that would be equally met by the Reduced Intensity Alternative include Objective 3, enhanced living and connectivity.

However, the Reduced Intensity Alternative’s ability to eliminate one of the three significant and unavoidable impacts that would result from the Project does not outweigh the benefit the Project provides at full buildout. As discussed in Section 9, *Significant Irreversible Changes Due to the Proposed Project*, California is in the midst of a long-term structural housing shortage and affordability crisis. The Legislature has declared a statewide housing crisis due to the shortage of available housing stock for all income levels, but especially for affordable housing. The lack of affordable housing also leads to other issues such as overcrowding and homelessness. The region in which the Specific Plan is proposed as one of the most hard hit by this crisis. In January 2020, over 66,000 people in Los Angeles County were experiencing homelessness, a nearly 13 percent increase from 2019 (LAO 2021). The Plan Area is an ideal location for the provision of affordable housing, and the Project Applicant has documented success in developing and operating communities where individuals and families thrive due to the opportunity of housing and security. Additionally, the Housing Element of the Long Beach General Plan consistently identified the Century Villages at Cabrillo Plan Area as an area to invest resources to expand and develop affordable housing and permanent supportive housing. The Specific Plan would be consistent with the City’s Housing Element and support the need for more housing in the state. As such, the reduction in impacts related to GHG cannot prevent the Project’s full potential to maximize achievement of its objectives.

Table 7-3 Ability of Alternatives to Meet Project Objectives

Project Objective	No Project/ No Development	Reduced Intensity
1. Integrate both new and rehabilitated residential development for the express purpose of providing transitional housing and support services to homeless veterans and the homeless population of the Long Beach metropolitan area.	Not Met	Partially Met
2. Allow for the long-term development and enhancement of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community to anchor residents, meet the evolving needs of the community and provide necessary support of resident’s mental, physical, and emotional health.	Not Met	Partially Met
3. Enhance the safety, livability, and connectivity of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community.	Not Met	Met

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Table 7-3 Ability of Alternatives to Meet Project Objectives

Project Objective	No Project/ No Development	Reduced Intensity
4. Guide redevelopment of an antiquated building stock and available land in order to accommodate increased demand for housing and services, while increasing energy efficiency.	Not Met	Partially Met
5. Develop enhanced and expanded open space and connectivity throughout the community to serve the needs of residents and employees.	Not Met	Met
6. Provide housings and services near the West Long Beach Transit Center and within a transit priority area consistent with Statewide and regional goals to reduce vehicle miles traveled.	Met	Partially Met
7. Enhance the continued fiscal health, viability, and success of the Century Villages at Cabrillo community.	Not Met	Partially Met

7.7 REFERENCES

California Council on Science and Technology (CCST). 2012, September. California's Energy Future: Portraits of Energy Systems for Meeting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets.
<http://www.ccst.us/publications/2012/2012ghg.pdf>.

Legislative Analyst's Office (LOA) 2021, January 21. California's Homelessness Challenges in Context.
<https://lao.ca.gov/handouts/localgov/2021/Homelessness-Challenges-in-Context-012121.pdf>

7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

This page intentionally left blank.