

6.1 Introduction and Overview

In accordance with Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives to the proposed project are discussed below.

An EIR must describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project, including alternative locations for the project that could feasibly attain most of the project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen any significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. Additionally, the No-Project Alternative must be analyzed in the draft EIR (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[a]).

The discussion of alternatives must focus on those alternatives capable of avoiding or substantially lessening the significant environmental effects of the proposed project, even if the alternative could impede to some degree attainment of all the project objectives or would be more costly (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[b]). The EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative other than the No-Project Alternative and explain why alternatives other than the proposed project were rejected (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[c]).

The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires an EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, the alternatives must be limited to ones that meet the project objectives, are ostensibly feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen at least one of the significant environmental effects of the project (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[f]). This chapter identifies several alternatives that attain some of the project objectives, are considered ostensibly feasible at this point, and could avoid or substantially lessen environmental impacts. These alternatives include the No-Project Alternative and the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

The EIR must briefly describe the rationale for the selection and rejection of alternatives and the information the lead agency relied on when making the selection. It should also identify any alternatives considered but rejected as infeasible by the lead agency during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons for the exclusion. Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, are

infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[c]). This chapter identifies and evaluates those alternatives considered by the lead agency and those that have been rejected from further consideration.

In developing an appropriate range of alternatives, the starting point is the project's objectives. As described in Chapter 2, the project's objectives are to

- replace deteriorated marina facilities with higher-value marine and visitor-oriented uses;
- provide waterfront access and use for the public;
- provide a vibrant public/private marina land and water community;
- provide a village of recreational marine and boating activities that draws together the boater, tourist, local and regional residents and the Port-oriented business community;
- improve the area's visual characteristics through the elimination of deteriorated facilities and the upgrading of existing marina facilities;
- create a new destination waterfront amenity;
- provide a vessel stack storage facility to accommodate increased public boat use and greater convenience and efficiency for boaters;
- provide restaurants, tour/charter/rental opportunities, and other uses to accommodate visitors and boaters;
- provide facilities that cater to larger recreational vessels;
- effectively compete with other waterfront facilities located in nearby jurisdictions to retain businesses and expenditures that might otherwise be lost; and
- provide a boat launch facility to accommodate increased public boat use and greater convenience and efficiency for boaters.

Each of the alternatives selected for evaluation in the EIR meets most of these objectives. The alternatives to the proposed project are discussed briefly below. Additionally, the alternatives eliminated from further consideration are identified and the rationale to support these decisions is also provided.

6.2 Alternatives Considered

During the preparation of the Recirculated Draft SEIR, the LAHD considered several alternatives for the proposed project. The goal for developing a set of possible alternative scenarios was to identify other means to attain the project objectives, while lessening or avoiding potentially significant environmental impacts caused by the proposed project. Additionally, some of the alternatives were considered in comparison to the previous 1998 proposal for redevelopment

of the Cabrillo Marina Phase I. The following alternatives are ostensibly feasible and were initially considered by the LAHD.

6.2.1 Alternative 1. No-Project Alternative

Section 15126.6 (e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires the analysis of a “no-project” Alternative. This “no-project” analysis must discuss the existing condition, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not to be approved. Since the proposed project is a development project, Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines is directly applicable to the project:

If the project is ... a development project on an identifiable property, the “no project” alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Here the discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects that would occur if the project were approved. If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this “no project” consequence should be discussed. In certain instances, the “no project” alternative means “no build” wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. However, where failure to proceed with the project will not result in preservation of existing environmental conditions, the analysis should identify the practical result of the project’s non-approval and not create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the “no-project” alternative analysis includes a discussion of the “no-build” alternative, 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 site zoning, as consistent with available infrastructure and community services. When the project is an individual development project on an identifiable location, the “no-project” alternative should also compare the environmental effects resulting from future predictable uses of the land. Both the “no-project/no-build” and the “no-project/reasonably foreseeable development” alternatives are considered in this Recirculated Draft SEIR.

Alternative 1A. No-Project/No-Build Alternative

Under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed, and the project area would remain in its current condition. The existing marina would remain in its existing condition, the warehouses would not be demolished, and the warehouse operations would continue under their current operating conditions.

Alternative 1B. No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative

Under the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed, and the project area would be developed according to future predictable uses of the land. Based on the PMP, the land use plans within the West Channel and West Bank have an emphasis on commercial and recreational activities. A portion of the project area is also designated for “general cargo” and “liquid bulk” operations. Therefore, this alternative would involve the development of a combination of cargo and liquid bulk commercial/industrial uses, as well as recreational uses associated with the marina.

6.2.2 Alternative 2. Mirror Image Marina Development with Limited Retail

Under this alternative, the Phase II Precise Plan for the West Channel/Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex originally proposed in 1987 would be implemented. This development option is referred as the Mirror Image Project since it would literally mirror image the Phase I development in terms of marina configuration. The project site would be developed with some of the same project elements as in the proposed project but with more emphasis on the waterside development. The landside development of the Mirror Image Project has limited visitor-serving retail/commercial uses compared to the proposed project.

6.2.3 Alternative 3. 1998 Cabrillo Marina Phase II Proposal

This alternative is similar to the proposed project, and involves development of the previous proposal as envisioned and analyzed in the 1998 Draft SEIR. The commercial, retail, and waterside components are assumed to be unchanged with respect to the proposed project. The major difference from the proposed project includes modifications to the intersection at Harbor Boulevard/Miner Street and 22nd Street (providing an aligned four-way intersection), and excluding the existing fruit warehouse and associated land area along the East Channel landside of the project area.

6.2.4 Alternative 4. Modified 1998 Proposal

This alternative is nearly the same as the Cabrillo Marina Phase II development proposed in 1998, and also very similar to the proposed project. However, this alternative involves retaining the existing fruit warehouse along the East Channel landside of the project site in order to accommodate preservation of the

warehouse and associated trucking operations. This in effect would reduce the land area for the marina improvements. This alternative would involve several alterations to the site plan, including reducing the width of Miner Street south of 22nd Street to a 28-foot undivided roadway (one 14-foot travel lane in both directions); shifting the alignment of Miner Street west of its present alignment to accommodate USCG security provisions; and shifting the dry stack boat storage building west to accommodate the realignment of Miner Street. Farther south, beyond the fruit warehouse area, Miner Street would generally return to its present alignment and continue as per the 1998 project plans. The waterside components are assumed to be unchanged for this alternative with respect to the proposed project. This alternative was conceived as an effort to reduce potential impacts associated with security and tenant lease issues.

6.2.5 Alternative 5. Alternative Location

The LAHD initially considered development of the project facilities at an alternative location to the West Channel area. Several coastal sites throughout southern California were considered, including potential sites at the Ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach, and elsewhere in southern California, such as in Oxnard (Ormond Beach), off the coast of El Segundo, Huntington Beach, and San Diego. Each of these sites would potentially require changes in existing Coastal and General Plans for these areas.

6.3 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration

As discussed above, the EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives. The lead agency may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are feasible and, therefore, merit in-depth consideration, and which are infeasible. Alternatives that are remote or speculative, or the effects of which cannot be reasonably predicted, need not be considered (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126[f][2]). This section identifies alternatives considered by the lead agency but rejected as infeasible and provides a brief explanation of the reasons for their exclusion. Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[c]). Several alternatives were considered in an attempt to alleviate impacts associated with the proposed project. Those that failed to meet the project objectives or were deemed infeasible, and therefore were eliminated from further consideration, are discussed below.

6.3.1 Alternative 3. 1998 Cabrillo Marina Phase II Proposal

Alternative 3, 1998 Cabrillo Marina Phase II Proposal, has been eliminated from further consideration because it has been determined to be infeasible. According to the USCG, this alternative could not be developed as planned due to security requirements around the fruit warehouse. These restrictions would require the developable area of the site to be significantly reduced to ensure adequate security for the remaining fruit warehouse operations. Therefore, this alternative has been rejected and eliminated from further consideration in this Recirculated Draft SEIR.

6.3.2 Alternative 5. Alternative Location

The location of the proposed project at other sites either inside or outside the jurisdiction of the Port was considered. The type of operations that occur in the proposed project would require that the project site be located in the coastal area of southern California. No sites are available in the region that would meet the requirements for the development of a new marina without major infrastructure improvements.

Potential sites at the Ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach, and elsewhere in southern California were reviewed as potential alternatives. No sites at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach are currently available. No existing sites are available for a new marina and related commercial development elsewhere in Ventura County or Orange County. No sites are planned in these areas. Potential sites may be developed in Oxnard (Ormond Beach), off the coast of El Segundo, Huntington Beach, and San Diego. These sites would not serve the local market under the proposed project and do not meet project objectives. Each of these alternatives would cause potentially greater impacts involving, but not limited to, land use compatibility, biota, water quality, noise, public health and safety, public services, and utilities than the proposed project. Each of these sites would potentially require changes in existing Coastal and General Plans for these areas.

6.4 Alternatives Analyzed in This EIR

This section presents an analysis of the alternatives that were found to achieve the project objectives, are considered ostensibly feasible, and may reduce environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. A comparison of the impacts of these alternatives with the proposed project impacts is provided. In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6[d]), the discussion of the environmental effects of the alternatives may be less detailed than the discussion of the impacts of the project proposed. Table 6-1 provides a summary of the impact analysis of the alternatives.

Table 6-1. Comparison of Alternatives* to the Proposed Project

Environmental Issue Area	Alt 1A	Alt. 1B	Alt. 2	Alt. 4
Geology	-1	0	0	0
Groundwater, Soil, and Sediments	+1	0	+1	0
Air Quality	-1	+1	-1	0
Water Quality and Oceanography	+1	+1	0	0
Biota and Habitats	-1	0	-1	+1
Noise	-1	+1	-1	0
Land Use	0	0	+1	0
Risk of Upset	0	+1	0	0
Transportation and Circulation	-1	+1	-1	0
Public Services and Utilities	-1	0	0	0
Light and Glare	-1	+1	0	0
Visual Resources and Aesthetics	+1	+1	-1	0
Recreation	+1	+1	+1	0
Cultural Resources	<u>-1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	-4	+8	-2	+1

Notes:

* Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration are not included.

(-1) = Impact considered to be less when compared with the proposed project.

(0) = Impact considered to be equal to the proposed project.

(+1) = Impact considered to be greater when compared with the proposed project.

6.4.1 Alternative 1A. No-Project/No-Build Alternative

The No-Project/No-Build Alternative involves no construction of the proposed project, and the project site would remain in its current condition. This alternative would not attain any of the project objectives. Environmental impacts associated with this alternative are analyzed below.

Geology

Existing facilities would continue to be operated as they have been for the last 50 years or longer, and will continue to be exposed to geologic/seismic impacts. Any subsequent use of the site would also be exposed to geological hazards. While this alternative would not involve engineering upgrades to existing

facilities as with the proposed project, no new construction of revetted slopes to protect the marina perimeter or vertical bulkheads would be created that could potentially result in geologic problems. Therefore, this alternative would represent fewer impacts on geology than the proposed project.

Groundwater, Soils, and Sediments

No dredging, excavation, landfill, revetment work, or commercial/retail development would occur under this alternative. With this alternative, no new impacts on groundwater, soils, and sediments would occur. However, any existing sediment contamination would remain because dredging would not occur under this alternative. Therefore, this alternative would result in greater groundwater, soils, and sediments impacts than the proposed project.

Air Quality

This alternative would continue to generate the same level of criteria pollutant emissions as the existing condition. However, this alternative would not involve new construction and would generate less traffic than the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would result in reduced air emissions as compared to the proposed project due to a reduction in vehicular trips and the lack of dust emissions and construction equipment emissions created during construction.

Water Quality and Oceanography

Water quality impacts from this alternative would be similar to existing conditions. The existing marina has more wet slips than the proposed project. The existing boats at Watchorn Basin need fuel and pumpout services; these services are currently provided just across the West Channel at Cabrillo Marina Phase I. The potential for accidental releases of material into harbor waters from this alternative would be similar to or greater than that of the proposed project because the existing condition includes a number of deteriorated facilities. The circulation benefits and long-term benefits from removing potentially contaminated sediments that would be accomplished in the proposed project would also not be realized in this alternative. Short-term impacts would likely be greater for the proposed project due to construction-related disturbances to water quality. However, this alternative represents slightly greater impacts on water quality than the proposed project.

Biota and Habitats

This alternative would have fewer impacts on biota and habitats than the existing condition. It would not result in loss of surface water area or fill, short-term

disruption to biota, or creation of new dock and piling habitat. Therefore, this alternative would represent fewer impacts than the proposed project.

Noise

Under this alternative, future traffic noise levels would increase slightly as a result of cumulative growth in the area. However, this alternative would not involve a project-related increase in traffic or general activity noise in the project area, and future noise conditions would be expected to remain essentially the same as existing conditions around the existing Watchorn Basin area. Additionally, no temporary construction-related noise would occur from this alternative as it would with the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer noise impacts than the proposed project.

Land Use

This alternative would have no significant effect on land use. While this alternative would not provide for new visitor-serving uses or recreational opportunities along the west side of the Main Channel south of the Vincent Thomas Bridge (as envisioned by the LAHD), this alternative would be consistent with existing land use plans for the Port, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, land use impacts from this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project.

Risk of Upset

The existing Port facilities within the project area currently contribute to limited public safety impacts related to boat maintenance and marina operations. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to increase risk of upset impacts. Therefore, this alternative would result in impacts similar to those of the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation

Implementation of this alternative would not involve any changes to the existing transportation system, with the exception of those already planned and approved as part of other cumulative projects within and around the Port. This alternative would involve fewer vehicular trips to the site, representing a reduced traffic and circulation impact compared to the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities

Fire protection and other public service requirements would continue under existing operations, with no additional public services required. The proposed project would result in an increased demand for public service and utilities, including fire protection, police protection, water, sewer, electricity, solid waste, and other services. Therefore, this alternative represents fewer impacts on public services than the proposed project.

Visual Resources and Aesthetics

Under this alternative, the project site would retain the existing landform, basin configurations, and mix of industrial and commercial land uses. No grading, dredging, infrastructure improvements, or construction would take place. The existing aesthetic character of the project site would remain unchanged. As the proposed project is intended to represent the completion of the recreational complex begun with implementation of Phase I of the West Channel/Cabrillo Marina Development Project, the project site would remain visually distinct from the redeveloped remainder of the West Channel. No physical changes would be visible from offsite areas, and views encompassing the project site and surrounding area would remain unchanged. The proposed project would involve some improvements to the visual character of the project area by providing more attractive architecture, landscaping, and overall improvements in the appearance of facilities within the West Channel area. However, this alternative would not involve the development of the dry stack storage building. Overall, the project is expected to enhance the visual setting of the project area; therefore, the proposed project would represent fewer impacts than this alternative.

Light and Glare

This alternative would not result in any changes to light and glare or shade and shadow in the project area. The existing site currently produces some amount of nighttime lighting that is visible from the surrounding area. While the proposed project would create additional sources of light and glare and shade and shadow, the project-related impacts have not been determined to be significant. Nevertheless, this alternative represents fewer impacts than the proposed project.

Recreation

This alternative would limit the waterside recreational opportunities and would continue to deny the public an enhanced waterfront experience. This alternative would not implement the infrastructure and facility improvements contained in the proposed project. Consequently, the positive benefits to the public, particularly enhanced waterfront access and use, would not be realized in the project site. The area would continue to be underutilized, with vacant parcels of

land scattered at the project site. This condition diminishes the potential benefits to the public that could be available, as is the case at the Cabrillo Marina. Therefore, this alternative would result in greater impacts on recreation than the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would not result in the demolition of the existing warehouses on the project site, and would not involve new grading or construction activities. While the warehouses onsite were determined to not be historically significant, the proposed project was found to potentially disturb unknown archaeological resources during construction. Therefore, this alternative would represent fewer impacts on cultural resources than the proposed project.

6.4.2 Alternative 1B. No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development

The No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative involves improvements of the site in accordance with the PMP. This alternative involves the development of waterside recreational facilities similar to the proposed project (i.e., marina facilities), as well as commercial marine facilities for cargo and liquid bulk. This alternative represents a considerable intensification of the site and does not involve commercial retail uses or dry dock storage. Environmental impacts associated with this alternative are analyzed below.

Geology

This alternative is not expected to require a substantial reconfiguration of land or water areas. However, new revetted slopes and vertical bulkheads would likely be required to accommodate future cargo and liquid bulk terminals, as well as marine facilities, within the project site. New facilities would be exposed to geologic/seismic impacts. As with the proposed project, any new development would be required to have any new facilities designed in compliance with the latest earthquake-resistant design and relevant codes available. This alternative would result in geologic impacts similar to those of the proposed project.

Groundwater, Soils, and Sediments

Dredging, excavation, landfill, revetment work, and marine development would occur under this alternative. With this alternative, similar potential soil and sediment contamination could be removed as a result of dredging operations. Therefore, impacts associated with this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project.

Air Quality

This alternative is expected to result in construction-related impacts similar to those associated with the proposed project. However, the commercial retail component would be reduced, thereby eliminating associated vehicular trips and air emissions. This alternative would include cargo and liquid bulk terminal operations, which would likely generate significantly greater shipping and trucking activities, thereby greatly increasing air emissions. Thus, air emissions from this alternative would be greater than those produced by the proposed project overall.

Water Quality and Oceanography

This alternative would result in similar impacts on water quality and oceanography within the Watchorn Basin during construction. With excavation and dredging, circulation would be improved over existing conditions similar to work associated with the proposed project. Operational impacts on water quality would likely be increased due to potential spills and debris runoff at the cargo and liquid bulk terminals. Therefore, impacts from this alternative would be greater.

Biota and Habitats

This alternative would result in similar impacts on biota and habitats as the proposed project. It would result in similar impacts on biota and habitats from waterside improvements, dredge and fill activities, and the creation of new dock and piling habitat.

Noise

This alternative would likely result in greater noise impacts from increased cargo and shipping activity within the project area, as well as increased trucking activities on surrounding roadways. Construction-related noise levels would be similar to those of the proposed project. Therefore, noise impacts of this alternative would be greater than those of the proposed project.

Land Use

This alternative would be consistent with Port plans and would be similar to the proposed project. Recreational boating activities that would take place under this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project, but an increase in commercial cargo and liquid bulk activity would occur. No zoning or plan

changes are required. Therefore, land use impacts are similar to those of the proposed project.

Risk of Upset

Under this alternative, future operations associated with cargo and liquid bulk operations could potentially impact public health and safety. Greater risk of upset would be associated with these potential uses, especially when located adjacent to high-intensity visitor-serving uses. Therefore, potential public health and safety impacts associated with this alternative would be greater than those of the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation

Under this alternative, the project site would be developed with some of the same waterside elements as in the proposed project, but with additional commercial cargo and liquid bulk facilities. These facilities would likely increase trucking within the project area. While vehicular trips associated with project-related commercial/ retail uses would be reduced, these trucking impacts would likely increase transportation and circulation impacts. Therefore, this alternative would represent an increase in transportation and circulation impacts as compared to the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities

The demand on fire protection and other public services would likely be similar for this alternative as a result of visitor-serving uses and commercial and industrial facilities. Given the mix of land uses that could occur, impacts on utilities are expected to be similar to the proposed project in terms of demand for water, sewer, and solid waste services. Therefore, impacts from this alternative would be comparable to those of the proposed project.

Visual Resources and Aesthetics

Under this alternative, the site would be developed with some commercial cargo and liquid bulk facilities. These types of uses would not be consistent with the existing recreational character of Cabrillo Marina Phase I or other uses within the Watchorn Basin. The aesthetic character of the project site would be less reflective of the marina and related activities, and fewer general public- and tourist-serving commercial uses would be developed. The character of cargo and liquid bulk facilities would likely have a less desirable visual quality than commercial and retail facilities on the site, and those facilities would stand out as distinct in visual conformity with the Phase I redevelopment of Cabrillo Marina.

Therefore, impacts on aesthetics would be greater than those anticipated under the proposed project.

Light and Glare

This alternative would result in greater changes to light and glare in the project area than the proposed project. With the addition of commercial cargo and liquid bulk terminals, additional high-intensity lighting could be included for nighttime operations. While the existing site currently produces some amount of nighttime lighting that is visible from the surrounding area, and the proposed project would include some additional lighting sources, this alternative represents a significant increase in lighting. These lighting effects would result in greater impacts than the proposed project.

Recreation

This alternative would provide fewer recreational facilities than the proposed project. The waterside improvements would be similar to the proposed project, but the commercial/retail components would be reduced. Because this alternative does not provide the same level of landside recreational opportunities as the proposed project, this alternative is regarded as having a greater impact on recreation than the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

This alternative is assumed to result in the demolition of existing warehouses on site and could potentially disturb unknown archaeological resources. This alternative would therefore result in impacts on cultural resources that are similar to those of the proposed project.

6.4.3 Alternative 2. Mirror Image Marina Development with Limited Retail

As discussed above, this alternative involves the development of similar facilities as the Cabrillo Way Marina Recreational Complex project as a “mirror image” configuration. The project site would be developed with some of the same project elements as in the proposed project but with more emphasis on the waterside development. The landside development of the Mirror Image Project has limited visitor-serving retail/commercial uses compared to the proposed project. With the associated removal and disposal of a significant quantity of material for the creation of the new water surface area, the costs of this alternative would be much greater than the proposed project, making it

economically infeasible. However, the impacts of this alternative are discussed below for comparison purposes.

Geology

This alternative would result in substantial reconfiguration of land and water areas. New facilities would be exposed to geologic/seismic impacts. Like the proposed project, any new development would be required to have any new facilities designed in compliance with the latest earthquake-resistant design and relevant codes available. This alternative would result in similar geologic impacts as the proposed project.

Groundwater, Soils, and Sediments

Dredging, excavation, landfill, revetment work, or commercial/retail development would occur under this alternative. With this alternative, any existing soil and sediment contamination would be removed as the situation warranted. This alternative could result in more area to be remediated as compared to the proposed project since it requires much more excavation work. Therefore, impacts associated with this alternative would be greater than those of the proposed project.

Air Quality

This alternative is expected to result in greater construction-related impacts than the proposed project due to the significantly greater amount of excavation and fill activities that would be required. However, this alternative would represent fewer vehicle trips due to the reduction of commercial retail uses onsite, thereby reducing operational air emissions. While this alternative would provide an increase in the number of boat slips within the marina, boating activities would be similar to the proposed project due to the provision of the dry stack storage as part of the proposed project. Thus, emissions from boating operations would be similar. Therefore, because construction emissions are considered temporary, and operation-related air quality impacts would be less for this alternative, impacts are considered to be reduced for this alternative compared to the proposed project.

Water Quality and Oceanography

This alternative would result in substantial reconfiguration of the landform on the project site, including modifications to the existing Watchorn Basin and the creation of a new marina basin. With excavation and dredging, temporary impacts on water quality would likely occur, but in the long term, circulation would be improved over existing conditions in a similar manner as under the

proposed project. Impacts on water quality from operations of this alternative would be expected to be similar to those of the proposed project.

Biota and Habitats

This alternative would result in substantial reconfiguration of the landform on the project site, including modifications to the existing Watchorn Basin and the creation of a new marina basin. It would create substantial additional surface water area, a new dock, and piling habitat. This additional water area would be placed in the Inner Harbor Mitigation Bank for future use. Temporary construction impacts would be greater than those of the proposed project. Operational impacts would be less than those of the proposed project because this alternative provides a net increase in water habitat within the harbor. Therefore, this alternative results in fewer impacts on biota and habitats than the proposed project.

Noise

Under this alternative, future boating operations would be expected to be substantially the same as under the proposed project. However, this alternative involves less retail use, which is expected to reduce traffic generation to the project area. Therefore, noise impacts of this alternative would be less than those of the proposed project. Construction-related noise levels would be similar to the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative represents a slight decrease in noise impacts compared to the proposed project.

Land Use

This alternative would be consistent with Port plans and would be similar to the proposed project. Similar commercial and recreational boating activities would take place under this alternative as under the proposed project. No zoning changes are required. Because this alternative involves a significant change in land and water surface area, it will require a PMP amendment, as will the proposed project. However, with this alternative the magnitude of the land and water area changes is greater. Therefore, land use impacts are regarded as greater than those of the proposed project.

Risk of Upset

Under this alternative, future operations would be expected to be substantially the same as under the proposed project. Although some project components would be relocated within the project site, potential public health and safety impacts associated with facility operations are not expected to differ significantly as compared to the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation

Under this alternative, the project site would be developed with some of the same project elements as in the proposed project but with more emphasis on the waterside development. The landside development of the alternative project has limited visitor-serving retail/commercial uses as compared to the proposed project, but the number of boat slips at the facility would be greater than under the proposed project. With the dry stack storage as part of the proposed project, this alternative results in opportunities for recreational boating within the Cabrillo Marina Phase I that are similar to those for the proposed project. Consequently, vehicular traffic generation to the project area resulting from this alternative would be similar to that of the proposed project. However, because this alternative involves less retail/commercial development, it consequently results in fewer vehicular trips. Therefore, the traffic impacts associated with this alternative would be less than those for the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities

Under this alternative, future operations would be expected to be substantially the same as under the proposed project. Fire protection and other public service requirements would be expected to be similar to those of the proposed project, but no additional public services would be expected. Although some project elements would differ, potential utility use is not expected to differ significantly from that of the proposed project.

Visual Resources and Aesthetics

Under this alternative, waterside improvements would be emphasized and would generally duplicate Cabrillo Marina Phase I in size and shape. The Watchorn Basin water surface area would be increased and overall marina capacity would be doubled. Expansion of the basin would result in correspondingly less land area available for landside development and decreased development density across the project site. The aesthetic character of the project site would be more directly reflective of the marina and related activities, and fewer general public- and tourist-serving commercial uses would be developed. The massing, bulk, and height of development would be reduced as compared to the proposed project, and the area dedicated as surface parking would be increased. However, implementation of this alternative would still result in redevelopment of the entire project site, removal and replacement of most existing industrial uses with commercial uses, and achievement of visual conformity with the redevelopment of Cabrillo Marina Phase I. Therefore, impacts on aesthetics would be less than those anticipated under the proposed project.

Light and Glare

Light and glare from this alternative would be expected to be similar to the proposed project. No intense lighting sources would be included in this alternative or the proposed project that would be considered to create a significant impact.

Recreation

This alternative would emphasize waterside improvements and would generally duplicate Cabrillo Marina Phase I in size and shape. The Watchorn Basin water surface area would be increased and overall marina capacity would be doubled. Expansion of the basin would result in correspondingly less land area available for landside development and decreased development density across the project site. This alternative does not provide the same level of landside recreational opportunities as the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative has greater impacts on recreation than the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would result in similar impacts on cultural resources as the proposed project.

6.4.4 Alternative 4. Modified 1998 Proposal

This alternative is nearly the same as the Cabrillo Marina Phase II development proposed in 1998, and also very similar to the proposed project. However, this alternative would retain the existing fruit warehouse east of the project site, along the East Channel. As discussed above, this alternative would also involve several alterations to the proposed project site plan, including reducing the width of Miner Street south of 22nd Street to a 28-foot undivided roadway (one 14-foot travel lane in both directions); shifting the alignment of Miner Street west of its present alignment to accommodate USCG security provisions; and shifting the dry stack boat storage building west to accommodate the realignment of Miner Street. Consequently, and similar to the 1998 proposed project, this alternative would increase the amount of dredge and fill in the harbor, thereby increasing impacts on biota and habitats that are associated with the project. Under this alternative, the existing intersection of Miner Street and 22nd Street would not be relocated; rather, Miner Street south of 22nd Street would be shifted approximately 150 feet to the west between 22nd Street and a point south of Adams Drive. This alternative would improve Miner Street to a 28-foot curb-to-curb width and a painted center median. It would retain the existing lane geometry on three legs of the intersection and the existing at-grade crossing but would modify the existing northbound lane configuration to provide a shared left-turn/through lane and a shared right-turn/through lane. The future

intersection was analyzed under the same cumulative conditions as the proposed project and was found to operate at LOS A during all analyzed time periods.

All other environmental impacts of this alternative are similar to the proposed project.

6.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative

An EIR must identify the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project. The No-Project/No-Build Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project on the basis of the minimization or avoidance of physical environmental impacts. As discussed above, this alternative would reduce impacts associated with the proposed project for geology, air quality, biota and habitats, noise, transportation and circulation, public services and utilities, light and glare, and cultural resources. However, the No-Project/No-Build Alternative does not meet the project objectives.

The CEQA Guidelines require that, if the No-Project Alternative is found to be environmentally superior, “the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[c]). Based on the assessment included within this chapter, Alternative 2, Mirror Image Marina Development with Limited Retail, would be considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative. As shown in Table 6-1 above, this alternative would result in an overall score of -2 compared to the proposed project, with some impacts that are greater (groundwater, soils, and sediments; land use; and recreation), and some impacts that are lesser (air quality, biota and habitats, noise, transportation and circulation, and aesthetics and visual resources) than those of the proposed project. However, this alternative represents an overall net decrease in impacts compared to the proposed project. All other alternatives would result in a net increase in total environmental impacts when compared to the proposed project.