VII. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR, "Describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of a project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." Section 15126.6(a) further provides that, "the 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." 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 primary objective to provide an evaluation of alternatives is to allow informed decisions for discretionary actions related to the project. Review of available alternatives allows evaluation of other methods of operation or locations of facilities that may be technologically and economically feasible and, if such alternatives meet these criteria, evaluation of whether or not their implementation would significantly reduce or eliminate significant impacts of the project.

Neither the CEQA statutes, the CEQA Guidelines, nor recent court cases specify a precise number of alternatives required to be discussed in an EIR. The CEQA Guidelines do, however, state that a "No Project" alternative must be included, and when appropriate, an alternative potentially feasible site location. Other project alternatives may involve modifications to the proposed land uses or other project elements at the same project location.

CEQA prohibits public agencies from approving projects as proposed if there are "feasible" alternatives or "feasible" mitigation measures available to the project proponent that substantially lessen the significant adverse environmental effects of such projects.[38]

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND DISMISSED

Over the past several years, a number of project scenarios have been considered for the former Metlox Pottery site. Previous applications for developing the property have included a 32-unit condominium

[38] *"Feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors. Title 14 C.C.R (CEQA Guidelines) §15364, and P.R.C §21061.01.*

project and a number of commercial development scenarios ranging between 200,000 square feet and the present proposal for 90,000 square feet. In formulating the Metlox project, the City of Manhattan Beach took an aggressive role in seeking community involvement. Through a number of community charettes and City Council meetings, a scaled down version of the project was ultimately approved for consideration. The community outreach program included a public Downtown Walking Tour, conducting a Strategic Issues Workshop with the public, and the creation of the Downtown Strategic Action Plan that specifically addressed future development objectives for the Metlox property. The 90,000 square foot project has essentially resulted as a product of compromise between active community groups, the City of Manhattan Beach, and the project's commercial applicant. In addition, a number of feasibility studies prepared for the City by Keyser Marston Associates Inc., assessed the potential return of income for a number of Alternative proposals including lodging components of 40 rooms, 75 rooms, and 90 rooms, and mixed-use commercial uses ranging between 200,000 and 90,000 square feet.

ALTERNATIVE PROJECT LOCATION - DISMISSED

The project's objectives are directly associated with the site specific goals of redeveloping existing uses at the Civic Center and redeveloping the former Metlox Potteries property, which has remained vacant for the past several years. As such, the project objectives to improve the existing Civic Center uses and add on to the Public Library and redevelop the former Metlox Pottery property are site specific objectives, which preclude the possibility of selecting an alternative location for either development scenario. The Metlox site is situated at the edge of the Downtown Commercial District providing a gateway to the Downtown Commercial District and beach. Accordingly, the project objective are formulated around site redevelopment and integration of the two contiguously located project sites. The project's objectives involve redeveloping the outdated and functionally deficient Police and Fire Department structures with a combined Public Safety Facility on-site, expanding or redeveloping the existing Public Library building, and integrating the Civic Center improvements with the Metlox commercial redevelopment. The design objectives for the Metlox portion of the project are also a function of its location; to provide a mix of unique local serving commercial tenants who will compliment and not compete with, the existing Downtown uses. For these reasons, an alternative site location would not provide a feasible alternative.

After consideration of the above issues and alternative possibilities, the following six project alternatives have been selected for analysis:

1) The No Project Alternative;

2) Civic Center Only. The Civic Center (as proposed) without the Metlox commercial development;

3) Metlox Development Only. The Metlox commercial development (as proposed) without the Civic Center improvements;

4) Reduced Density Alternative. The Civic Center (as proposed) with a 60,000 square foot Metlox commercial development (includes surface parking only);

5) Increased Parking Alternative. The Civic Center (as proposed) with a 90,000 Metlox commercial development (as proposed) with an additional level of subterranean parking; and

6) Alternative Mixed-Use Metlox Development. The Civic Center (as proposed) with a 90,000 square foot Metlox commercial development with an alternative mix of commercial uses.

VII. A. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that a "No Project" alternative be evaluated along with its environmental impact. The purpose of describing and analyzing a "No Project" alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The baseline conditions for the "No Project" analysis are based on the existing environmental conditions at the time of the Notice of Preparation. In addition to taking no further action on the proposed project, CEQA requires the "No Project" alternative analysis to include assumptions about what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (e)(2)).

For purposes of this analysis, the No Project Alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not go forward. For the Civic Center portion of this project, no improvements or modifications would be made to the existing Fire Department, Police Department, or Public Library buildings. These facilities would continue operating under their current conditions and no structural improvements would be provided. The proposed Cultural Arts Center addition to the Public Library would not be constructed under this alternative.

With regards to Metlox site, possibilities for potential future development remain too speculative to assume at this time. Currently, the City owns the property and is seeking to develop the property through a partnership with a commercial developer. Without a joint development, the City may choose to sell the Metlox property in an attempt to recover its initial investment. In this event, a maximum commercial development scenario, consistent with the current zoning regulations for the CD District would likely be proposed by a private developer. However, considering the City's interest in this property, and the community's influence in limiting commercial development on the Metlox site, any development scenario would be too speculative to consider at this point in time. For purposes of this analysis, no further development is assumed to occur within the foreseeable future on this property. The No Project assumptions include the site remaining as is, which includes a vacant fenced off lot and the continued use of the temporary parking lot until the temporary use permit expires.

Environmental Impacts

Aesthetics

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no changes to the existing visual environment on the project site. The buildings on the Civic Center site would remain in use in their current condition. The Metlox property would remain undeveloped with the partial use of the temporary parking lot. Existing

views of the project site would remain as depicted in Figures 9 through 19 in Section V.A. Aesthetics/Views. No obstruction of views would occur under this alternative. However, none of the beneficial aesthetic impacts of the project development would be realized.

Air Quality

The No Project Alternative would not involve any new construction activity and would not increase any of the existing uses or operations on the project site. No demolition or construction emissions would be generated. No additional vehicle trips would be generated to the site, thus no additional vehicle emissions would be generated. Ambient air quality conditions would essentially remain the same as characterized in the environmental setting discussion in Section V.B. Air Quality. Air Quality impacts would thus be less than significant and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Land Use

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing land uses on the Civic Center site would remain the same. The Civic Center would continue daily operations within the existing facilities and no on-site improvements would be made. The existing Civic Center uses are consistent with the current "Public Facility" and "Public and Semi Public District" land use and zoning designations for the site. No variances or development agreements would be needed.

No foreseeable development would occur on the Metlox site under this alternative. The present temporary use of the parking lot on the Metlox site would continue until expiration of the existing temporary use permit. The existing approval for the parking lot use indicates that the permit is valid for a two-year period expiring in 2000, with an extension of up to two years. The resolution specifically states that: "The Use permit and Coastal Development Permit, under no circumstances, shall remain valid after April 22, 2002." Therefore the only land use action that would foreseeably occur under this alternative would be the discontinuation of the public parking lot.

Public Services (Police Protection)

Under the No Project Alternative, no improvements to the Civic Center would occur. The existing Police and Fire Department buildings would continue operating under their current conditions. As documented in the City's Public Facility Fact Sheets, the existing Police and Fire Department facilities are currently operating with a number of physical and operational shortcomings that negatively affect their ability to serve the public.[39] (See the environmental setting discussion of Section V.D. Public

[39] *Source: The City of Manhattan Beach Police Department Fact Sheet at website; http:// www.ci.manhattan-beach.ca.us/.*

Services). Since the City has identified deficiencies with both Fire and Police Department buildings, the continued operation of Police and Fire Department services without any improvements to the existing facilities would have a negative impact upon Public Services, as compared to what would occur with the Civic Center improvements proposed with the project. With selection of the No Project Alternative, none of the benefits of the proposed Public Safety Facility would be realized.

With regard to increased demands upon public safety services, this Alternative would not result in any increase to the on-site population for either the Civic Center or Metlox site. As such, the demand for additional services would not increase under this scenario.

Risk of Upset

The No Project Alternative would not generate any increased risk of hazardous materials exposure over existing conditions. Hazardous materials presently stored and used on-site are generally limited to small quantities of common household cleaning solvents and supplies. The Manhattan Beach Fire Department currently utilizes a 250 gallon aboveground storage tank (AST), which stores diesel used to fuel MBFD's trucks and other City vehicles. According to records maintained by the MBFD, regular inspections of the tank have not revealed any leakage of diesel.

Following closure of the Metlox Potteries operations in 1989, the Metlox site has been remediated to remove unacceptable levels of lead, cadmium, and zinc from the soil. Based on the information in the closure report for the Metlox Site, the Los Angeles County Fire Department concurred that the known site contamination had been satisfactorily mitigated for use.[40] Leaving the former Metlox Potteries site vacant would not pose any threat or risk of upset to the general public. Impacts would essentially be the same under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

Transportation/Circulation

Traffic. Based on the ambient traffic growth assumptions used in the Traffic Study, the existing (2000) traffic was growth-factored by 2.0 percent per year for five years to form the future year 2005 "Without Project" condition. The resulting 2005 peak hour traffic volumes for winter weekdays, summer weekdays and summer weekends are shown in Figures 29(a) through 31(b) in Section V.F of this Draft EIR. These volumes represent the "benchmark" values for determining project traffic impacts on the street system without the proposed project. Future 2005 Traffic volumes without the

[40] *County of Los Angeles Fire Department Site Mitigation Unit Health Hazardous Materials Division, Thomas W. Klinger, Supervisor, correspondence, June 26, 1996.*

proposed project are anticipated to experience unacceptable level of service values (i.e., LOS F) at the following 8 intersections:

- Marine Ave. & Highland Ave (winter weekdays PM peak hour);
- Valley Drive and Blanche Road (summer weekdays AM & PM peak hours);
- Ardmore Ave./Marine Ave. and Pacific Ave. (summer weekdays PM peak hour).
- Marine Ave. & Sepulveda Blvd (winter and summer weekdays AM & PM peak Hours, summer Saturdays peak hour);
- Highland Ave. & 15th Street (winter weekdays PM peak hour, summer weekdays and weekends AM & PM peak hours);
- Manhattan Beach Blvd. and Valley Drive/Ardmore (summer weekdays PM peak hour).
- Manhattan Beach Blvd. & Sepulveda Blvd. (winter and summer weekdays and summer weekends AM & PM peak hours);
- Ardmore Ave. & 2nd Street (winter weekdays AM peak hour).

Parking. Under the No project Alternative no new parking will be provided on-site. The Civic Center uses will continue to operate with at parking deficiency relative to the assessed demand previously calculated in the City of Manhattan Beach Civic Center Public Safety Facility needs assessment data.[41] The temporary parking lot on the Metlox property would continue operating under the terms of the temporary use variance. The conditions applied to this permit indicate that the permit is valid for a two-year period expiring in 2000, with an extension of up to two years. The resolution states that: "The Use permit and Coastal Development Permit, under no circumstances, shall remain valid after April 22, 2002." Therefore, upon expiration of the existing permit, a net loss of 125 parking spaces in the Downtown area could occur. Parking impacts would be greater under this alternative than with development of the proposed project.

---

[41] *Manhattan Beach Public Safety Facility Review, City of Manhattan Beach & Leach Mounce Architects, July 6, 1995.*

Hydrology/Water Quality

No physical alteration of the site would occur under the No Project Alterative. As such, hydrologic conditions such as surface water infiltration, surface water runoff (rate), and direction (flow) would remain unchanged. Water pollution from surface water runoff from the existing parking lots would remain consistent with the existing conditions. It is anticipated that water pollution impacts would be greater under this alternative than with the proposed project because a larger area is currently used for surface parking than what would occur under the proposed project. Although the project does include some surface parking areas, the project will provide a majority of the on-site parking in subterranean garages and would convert existing parking areas into hardscaped paseos and Town Center areas. With development of the proposed project a total of 178 fewer parking spaces would be exposed to storm water runoff and a net beneficial impact on the quality of surface water runoff would result. Therefore, the beneficial water quality impacts expected under the proposed project would not be realized and water quality impacts would be greater under the No Project Alternative as compared to the proposed project.

Noise

The No Project Alternative would not involve any demolition or construction activities on the project site and would not increase the existing uses on the project site. As such, no construction-related noise impacts would occur. Noise from operational impacts would remain consistent with the existing ambient noise characteristics as described in Section V.H. Noise. Noise impacts would be reduced under this alternative as compared to the project.

VII. B. CIVIC CENTER DEVELOPMENT ONLY

Under the "Civic Center Development Only Alternative", improvements for the Civic Center would be implemented as proposed under the proposed project and no future development would occur on the Metlox property in the immediate future. As analyzed under the proposed project, the Civic Center includes a complete demolition and reconstruction of the existing Police and Fire Department and Public Library facilities. Due to the age and condition of the existing structures, the Fire Department building (10,568 square feet) and Police Department building (20,000 square feet) will be entirely demolished and reconstructed on-site. These facilities are proposed to be replaced with a two-level (one level below grade), approximately 57,000 square foot combined Police and Fire Department public safety facility incorporating all administrative and operational functions of these departments. The net increase in developed floor area over existing conditions will be approximately 26,432 square feet. The proposed structure is intended to accommodate the spatial and modernization needs of both departments and will not involve any staffing or personnel increases.

The Civic Center would also undergo reconstruction or expansion of the existing Public Library building. The existing Public Library (12,100 square feet) will either be added on to or demolished and reconstructed with a new Public Library and Cultural Arts Center. Upon completion, the proposed Library and Cultural Arts Center will consist of an approximate 40,000 square foot structure with roughly 30,000 square feet for library space and 10,000 square feet for a 99-seat Cultural Arts Center. The Library will contain reference materials and periodicals for children through teens to adults, meeting and reading rooms, and restrooms for the community and offices for staff. The Cultural Arts Center will contain a stage for live community performances, dressing rooms, lobby, offices, kitchenette, restrooms, and exhibition space. A summary of the proposed uses under this alternative is provided in Table 31 on page 202.

Access to public parking will be provided via 15th Street and Valley Drive. The public driveway at 15th Street, adjacent to the City Hall Building, will provide access to surface parking, as well as access to below grade parking via a driveway ramp located within the interior of the surface parking lot. An additional subterranean parking driveway will be provided on 15th Street adjacent to the proposed Public Safety Facility for secured parking. The Valley Drive driveway will provide secured access for employee parking and City vehicles. The subterranean level will provide 116 secure parking spaces for Police/Fire Department functions, and 87 spaces for Civic Center public and staff. The on-grade parking will provide 61 secure spaces for Police/Fire Department use, and 86 spaces for Civic Center public and staff parking. The total number of spaces provided for the redeveloped Civic Center is 350

Table 31
Civic Center Only Development Alternative

Proposed Uses	Existing Development (sq. ft.)	Proposed Development (sq. ft.)	Net Increase (sq. ft.)
Fire Department	10,568	57,000 (combined)	26,432
Police Department	20,000		
Public Library	12,100	30,000	17,900
Cultural Arts Center	0	10,000	10,000
Total	**42,668**	**97,000**	**54,332**

(203 subterranean and 147 on-grade). Existing roadway configurations and traffic patterns would remain unchanged under this alternative.

Environmental Impacts

Aesthetics

With regard to aesthetic impacts, views under the Civic Center Alternative would be the same as presented in the project analysis for the Civic Center site. Existing views that would be partially or completely effected by the new Civic Center structures were identified in Section V.A. Aesthetics as Existing View No. 5 and Existing Views 7 through 17. As discussed in the project analysis, redevelopment of the Civic Center site would reflect a positive change in the existing visual character of the Civic Center area. The new Public Safety Facility would be developed in a manner consistent with the design guidelines of the LCP for public facilities and would not exceed the maximum height limitation of 30 feet. Due to the presence of the existing Police and Fire Department buildings on-site, there are no current ocean views provided from areas directly east of the Civic Center site looking westbound.

This Alternative would not involve any improvements or change from existing conditions on the Metlox site. Aesthetic impacts in terms of obstruction of ocean views would therefore be reduced under the Civic Center Alternative because no new structures would be developed on the Metlox site. However, none of the beneficial impacts of redeveloping the former Metlox Potteries site would be realized. The Metlox site would remain vacant and fenced off and partially used as a surface parking lot.

Air Quality

Implementation of the Civic Center Only Alternative would reduce total new construction by approximately 48 percent as compared to the proposed project. As such, PM_{10} emissions would be greatly reduced. Air quality impacts associated with the construction phase would therefore be reduced under this alternative.

Operational impacts under this alternative would also be reduced as the vehicle trip generation associated with the Metlox commercial development would not occur. As indicated in the project analysis, the vehicle trips generated by the Civic Center equate to approximately 10 percent of the overall trip generation of the project. Accordingly, air quality impacts from vehicular emissions would be reduced by approximately 90 percent for vehicular emission sources. Operational air quality impacts would thus fall below the significance thresholds as they would be greatly reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Land Use

Land use impacts resulting from the development of this alternative would be the same as that presented in the proposed project analysis for the Civic Center site. The uses proposed for the Civic Center portion of the project are consistent with the existing uses on site in which they are replacing and are consistent with the permitted uses allowed under the General Plan and zoning designations. The Public Safety Facility and the Public Library and Cultural Arts Center will be designed and constructed to a density that would not exceed the 30-foot height restriction for the PS zone. The Civic Center improvements would not exceed the maximum floor area density permitted under the LCP regulations. Therefore land use impacts would be similar to the proposed project and less than significant.

No foreseeable development would occur on the Metlox site under this alternative. The present temporary use of the parking lot on the Metlox site would continue until expiration of the existing temporary use permit. The existing approval for the parking lot use indicates that the permit is valid for a two-year period expiring in 2000, with an extension of up to two years. The resolution specifically states that: "The Use permit and Coastal Development Permit, under no circumstances, shall remain valid after April 22, 2002." Therefore the only land use action that would foreseeably occur under this alternative would be the discontinuation of the public parking lot.

Public Services (Police Protection)

Under this alternative, the existing Police and Fire Department buildings would be demolished and replaced with a two-level (one level below grade), approximately 57,000 square foot combined Public Safety Facility incorporating all administrative and operational functions of the Police and Fire

Departments. The net increase in developed floor area for these uses would be approximately 26,432 square feet. The proposed structure is intended to accommodate the spatial and modernization needs of both departments and will not involve any staffing or personnel increases. As documented in the Public Facility Fact Sheets, the existing Police and Fire Department facilities are currently operating with a number of physical and operational shortcomings that negatively affect their ability to serve the public.[42] (See the environmental setting discussion of Section V.D. Public Services). With implementation of the Civic Center Only Alternative, impacts upon police protection would be beneficial and less than significant.

Risk of Upset

Impacts associated with risk of upset and hazardous materials would be the same under the Civic Center Alternative as addressed for the Civic Center site under the proposed project. Health and environmental risks associated with ACMs, lead based paint, and PCBs would be the same under this alternative as compared to the project. These impacts, however, can be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures.

The MBFD utilizes an AST, containing diesel used to fuel the department's vehicles. The AST would be removed during demolition of the existing on-site uses and replaced during project construction. Other potentially hazardous materials that mat be used and/or stored on the Civic Center site include common household cleaners, solvents, paints, or lacquers. These chemicals would be removed from the structures prior to demolition and construction so as to avoid any accidental release or risk of upset from potentially hazardous substances. The associated risks of storing and or using such materials on site after construction is complete would be adequately reduced to acceptable levels of safety via continued compliance with federal, state and local regulations. Therefore, risk of upset would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Transportation/Circulation

Traffic. Under the Civic Center Alternative, the existing traffic and circulation patterns of the Police and Fire Departments would generally be unchanged as compared to existing conditions. As described in Section V.F. Transportation and Circulation, no additional vehicle trips are anticipated to be generated by the proposed Public Safety Facility. Because the City is essentially operating at, or close to full build out, the City does not anticipate any staffing increases for future Police or Fire Department operations. The only additional trips that would be generated under this alternative would be those

---

[42] *Source: The City of Manhattan Beach Police Department Fact Sheet at website; http:// www.ci.manhattan-beach.ca.us/.*

related to the expansion of the Public Library and Cultural Arts Center. It is anticipated that the proposed Public Library and Cultural Arts Center will generate an additional 337 daily trips to the Civic Center site, with no more than 22 trips occurring within PM peak hours. Because the Library does not open until 10:00 AM, no AM peak hour trips would be generated. This increase equates to less than 10% of the project volumes. As such, impacts under this alternative would be nearly identical to that of the No Project Alternative (i.e., "Future 2005 Without Project"). Traffic impacts would be reduced under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

Parking. Currently there are 220 parking spaces on the Civic Center site. With Development of this alternative, approximately 350 parking spaces will be provided at the Civic Center. Based on information provided by the City of Manhattan Beach, parking demand estimates for the Civic Center indicate a need for 306 parking spaces.[43] This demand would be met with a surplus of 44 additional parking spaces.

Under this alternative the temporary surface parking lot on the Metlox property would continue operating under the terms of the temporary use variance until it's expiration in April 2002. At that time, a net loss of 125 parking spaces in the Downtown area would occur. Parking impacts would therefore be increased with this Alternative.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Since more than 25 additional parking spaces would be developed under this alternative, the City would be required to comply with the NPDES and recently enacted SUSMP requirements. Construction of alternative would have the potential to induce soil erosion and sedimentation during the construction process, though to a lesser extent than the proposed project. This is primarily due to the smaller project size and proportional decrease in grading operations. Impacts would be less than significant and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Noise

Implementation of the Civic Center Alternative would reduce construction activities by approximately 48 percent as compared to the proposed project. As such, noise impacts associated with developing the site would be reduced in a similarly proportional amount. Noise impacts associated with the construction phase would therefore be less than significant and reduced under this alternative.

---

[43] *Manhattan Beach Public Safety Review, City of Manhattan Beach and Leach Mounce Architects, July 6, 1995.*

Operational impacts under this alternative would also be reduced as the vehicle trip generation associated with the Metlox commercial development would not occur. As indicated in the project analysis, the vehicle trips associated with the Civic Center account for less than 10 percent of the overall trip generation of the project. Accordingly, noise impacts from vehicles would be reduced by a comparable amount roughly proportional to vehicle trips estimated for the Metlox development that would not occur. Noise impacts would be further reduced because of a reduction in overall site activity (pedestrian activity, outdoor restaurant activities, town center activities, etc.). Operational noise impacts would fall below the significance thresholds as they would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

VII. C. METLOX DEVELOPMENT ONLY

The "Metlox Development Only Alternative" assumes that only the commercial Metlox portion of the project would be implemented and the Civic Center site would remain "as is" with no improvements. The existing police fire and public library buildings will be maintained and will continue to operate as they are under current conditions. This alternative would include approximately 90,000 square feet including retail, restaurant, office uses, and a 40-room Bed and Breakfast lodging component. The preliminary design envisions one- and two-story buildings oriented around the streets, outdoor plazas (paseos) and a Town Square. A summary of this Metlox Alternative scenario is provided in Table 32 on page 208.

Approximately 36,686 square feet of the Metlox area is proposed to be developed as public open space. Such space will include the Town Square, paseos and a sculpture garden. The Town Square will include a Lookout Tower element, to offer public views of the pier, beach, ocean and other local landmarks in the Downtown area. An additional 3,898 square feet of open space is proposed as a garden area for the proposed bed and breakfast inn.

An important aspect of the proposed project is to provide a pedestrian linkage between the Metlox Development and the Civic Center. This aspect of the proposed project would still occur under this alternative, though to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Similar to the project, pedestrian circulation around the site will be provided by sidewalks located contiguous to the perimeter streets (Valley Drive, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, Morningside Drive and 13th Street). The extension of pedestrian paseos, plazas and courtyards, however, would be limited to the Metlox site and would join the Civic Center at its southernmost parking lot.

Environmental Impacts

Aesthetics

Views under the Metlox Only Alternative would generally be the same as presented in the project analysis addressing the Metlox site. Existing views that would be partially or completely effected by the Metlox Development are identified in Section V.A. Aesthetics as Existing Views 1 through 7 and Existing Views 17 through 22. As discussed in the project analysis, development of the Metlox site would, for the most part, reflect a positive change in the existing visual environment. Views of the Civic Center site (i.e., Existing Views 8 through 16) would remain unchanged as no new development would occur on that site. The design plans for the Metlox commercial structures appear to

Table 32
Metlox Development Only Alternative

Proposed Uses	Proposed Development (sq. ft.)
Restaurants	6,400
Retail (misc.)	18,500
Bakery	2,168
Nursery Garden Store	2,500
Commercial Office	26,411
Day Spa	3,000
Bed and Breakfast Inn (+/-40 rooms)	30,780
Total	**89,759**

be substantially consistent with the design guidelines of the LCP for the Downtown Commercial District. With the exception of the Lookout Tower, the structures would not exceed the maximum height limitation of 30 feet. Impacts associated with obstruction of views would be the same under this alternative as the only view identified as having a partial view obstruction of ocean views was View No. 4, which looks directly over the Metlox Site in the vicinity of the proposed Lookout Tower. However, only a portion of this view is expected to be obstructed and a partial ocean view would still remain. View impacts under this alternative would be less than significant, and generally similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

Air quality impacts under this alternative would be generally similar to the proposed project impacts. Implementation of the Metlox Development Only Alternative would reduce total new construction by approximately 52 percent as compared to the proposed project. As such, PM_{10} emissions would be greatly reduced. Air quality impacts associated with the construction phase would therefore be reduced under this alternative. Since construction impacts would be further reduced as compared to the proposed project, air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Operational impacts under this alternative would be slightly reduced as the additional vehicle trip generation associated with the Public Library and Cultural Arts Center would not occur. As indicated in the project analysis, the vehicle trips associated with the Civic Center equates to approximately 10 percent of the overall trip generation of the project. Accordingly, air quality impacts from vehicular emissions would be reduced by approximately 10 percent for vehicular emission sources. Operational

air quality impacts would thus fall below the significance thresholds as they would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Land Use

Land use impacts resulting from the development of this alternative would be the same as that presented in the proposed project analysis for the Metlox site. The uses proposed for the Metlox site are consistent with the permitted uses allowed under the General Plan and zoning designations. The commercial structures would be designed and constructed to a density that would not exceed the allowable FAR or the 30-foot height restriction for the CD zone. Therefore land use impacts would be similar to the proposed project and less than significant.

Public Services (Police Protection)

Under this Alternative, no improvements to the Civic Center would occur. The existing Police and Fire Department buildings would continue operating under their current conditions. As documented in the City's Public Facility Fact Sheets, the existing Police and Fire Department facilities are currently operating with a number of physical and operational shortcomings that negatively affect their ability to serve the public.[44] (See the environmental setting discussion of Section D. Public Services/Police Protection). Since the City has identified deficiencies with both Fire and Police Department buildings, the continued operation of Police and Fire Department services without any improvements to the existing facilities would have a negative impact upon Public Services, as compared to what would occur with the Civic Center improvements proposed with the project. With selection of the No Project Alternative, none of the benefits of the proposed Public Safety Facility would be realized.

The demands for police services under this Alternative would be the same under this alternative as the proposed project because the Metlox development would be implemented in either scenario. There would still be a police presence on site since the Police Department would continue operations within the Civic Center. Such impacts would be identical to those identified for the proposed project.

Risk of Upset

Impacts associated with risk of upset and hazardous materials would be the same under this alternative as addressed for the Metlox site under the proposed project. Potential impacts associates with releasing ACMs, lead based paint, or PCBs during demolition activities would be avoided as none of the Civic

---

[44] *Source: The City of Manhattan Beach Police Department Fact Sheet at website; http:// www.ci.manhattan-beach.ca.us/.*

Center buildings would be demolished. The only potentially hazardous materials that mat be used and/or stored on the Metlox site would include common household cleaners, solvents, paints, or lacquers. These chemicals would be removed from the structures prior to demolition and construction so as to avoid any accidental release or risk of upset from potentially hazardous substances. The associated risks of storing and or using such materials on site after construction is complete would be adequately reduced to acceptable levels of safety via continued compliance with federal, state and local regulations. Therefore, risk of upset would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Transportation/Circulation

Traffic. Under the Metlox Only Alternative, the resulting traffic volumes would be generally the same as proposed for the project. No additional vehicle trips associated with the Library component would be generated. As indicated previously, the vehicle trips associated with the Library and Cultural Arts Center constitute roughly 10 percent of the total traffic volumes of the project. This would equate to slightly decreased traffic impacts under this alternative.

Parking. Currently there are 220 parking spaces on the Civic Center site. With Development of this alternative, approximately 212 additional parking spaces will be provided at the Metlox site. Based on a shared parking demand analysis the 212 spaces for the project would be adequate. However, according to information provided by the City of Manhattan Beach, parking demand estimates for the Civic Center indicate a need for 306 parking spaces.[45] This demand would not be met and no surplus parking would be provided. Parking impacts would be increased under this alternative. However, because the Metlox project will provide adequate parking based on a shared parking demand analysis, impacts would be less than significant.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Construction of this alternative would have the potential to induce soil erosion and sedimentation processes during the construction period, though to a lesser extent than the proposed project. This is primarily due to the smaller construction area involved and proportional decrease in grading operations. However, operational impacts would result in a higher levels of oil and grease contaminants entering the storm drain system, and eventually the Pacific Ocean. Under this alternative a total of 220 parking spaces would remain in surface parking lots on the Civic Center site. As compared to the proposed project, which would provide only 147 surface parking spaces, more vehicles would be exposed to

---

[45] *Manhattan Beach Public Safety Review, City of Manhattan Beach and Leach Mounce Architects, July 6, 1995.*

stormwater, thus contributing to water quality degradation via surface water runoff. Water quality impacts would be increased as compared to the proposed project.

Noise

Implementation of the Metlox Alternative would reduce total new construction (as compared to the proposed project) by approximately 52 percent. As such, noise impacts associated with developing the site would be reduced in a similarly proportional amount. Noise impacts associated with the construction phase would therefore be less than significant and reduced under this alternative. This alternative would still result in unavoidable significant construction noise impacts because of the close proximity of sensitive residential land uses.

Operational impacts under this alternative would be reduced to some extent as the vehicle trip generation associated with the Library component would not occur. As indicated in the project analysis, the vehicle trips associated with the Civic Center account for approximately 10 percent of the overall trip generation of the project. Accordingly, noise impacts from vehicles would be slightly reduced. However, this decrease would not be perceptible. Nuisance noise impacts would also be reduced because of a reduction in on-site activities associated with integration of the Civic Center site. Operational noise impacts would be below the significance thresholds as they would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

VII. D. REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the Civic Center is proposed as defined for the proposed project. The Metlox Development, however, will be developed at a reduced density not to exceed 60,000 square feet. In addition, the proposed alternative is envisioned with surface parking only, with the subterranean parking garage being removed from the concept. With a 60,000 square foot commercial development occurring on the Metlox site, the code required parking would be met with a surface parking lot. The Reduced Density Metlox development would consist of a similar mixed-use commercial development with surface parking. As depicted in Table 33 on page 213, the total floor area proposed for this alternative would be approximately 60,000 square feet including retail, restaurant, and office uses, and a 40-room lodging component. The alternative design would include one- and two-story buildings oriented around the streets, outdoor plazas (paseos) and a Town Square. Some of the identified feature elements of the proposal include a Gateway Plaza, a Town Square, a Lookout Tower, outdoor dining and a bed and breakfast style inn. Similar to the proposed project, the desired tenant mix will be comprised of both independent retailers and restaurants, and several high quality credit tenants. Pedestrian circulation around the site will be provided by sidewalks located contiguous to the perimeter streets (Valley Drive, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, Morningside Drive and 13th Street).

Environmental Impacts

Aesthetics

Views under the Reduced Density Alternative would generally be the same as presented in the project analysis addressing the Metlox site. Impacts to existing views of the Civic Center Site would be similar to the proposed project (i.e., Existing Views 8 through 16). Existing views that would be partially or completely effected by the Metlox Development are identified in Section V.A. Aesthetics as Existing Views 1 through 7 and Existing Views 17 through 22. The Metlox component of the project under this alternative represents approximately 66 percent of the commercial development proposed under the project. With a development of this size it would not be feasible to construct an underground parking structure. In that regard, all parking for this alternative will be provided in surface parking lot areas. As such, architectural revisions would be required to accommodate the parking areas and the proposed structures. As discussed in the project analysis, development of the Metlox Site would, for the most part, reflect a positive change in the existing visual character of the area. Views of the Civic Center site would remain unchanged as no new development would occur on that site. The design plans for the Metlox commercial structures appear to be substantially consistent with the design guidelines of the

Table 33
Reduced Density Alternative

Proposed Uses	Existing Development (sq. ft.)	Proposed Development (sq. ft.)	Net Increase (sq. ft.)
Civic Center Site			
Fire Department	10,568	57,000 (combined)	26,432
Police Department	20,000		
Public Library	12,100	30,000	17,900
Cultural Arts Center	0	10,000	10,000
Sub-Total	**42,668**	**97,000**	**54,332**
Metlox Reduced Density Development			
Restaurants	N/A	6,400	6,400
Retail (misc.)	N/A	5,000	5,000
Nursery Garden Store	N/A	2,300	2,300
Commercial Office	N/A	7.500	7,500
Day Spa	N/A	3,000	3,000
Inn (+/-40 rooms)	N/A	33,280	33,280
Sub-Total		**57,480**	**57,480**
TOTAL			**111,812**

LCP for the Downtown Commercial District. With the exception of the Lookout Tower, structures would not exceed the maximum height limitation of 30 feet. View impacts under this alternative would be less than significant, and generally similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

The Reduced Density Alternative will reduce development on the Metlox site by approximately 32,279 square feet (i.e., approximately 36 percent). Implementation of this alternative would therefore reduce construction activities by approximately 23 percent as compared to the proposed project. As such, PM_{10} emissions would be proportionally reduced. Construction-related air quality impacts would be less than significant and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Table 34
Daily Operation Emissions – Reduced Density Alternative[1]

Project	Daily Trips	Pollutant			
		CO	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}
Proposed Project	3,442	195	22	39	22
Reduced Density Alternative	2,204	125	15	25	14
SCAQMD Threshold		**550**	**55**	**55**	**150**
Exceed Threshold?		**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

[1] Daily emissions are expressed in pounds per day.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates, URBEMIS 7G Output results, October 2000.

Operational air quality impacts under this alternative would also be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Approximately 2,204 vehicular trips would be generated under this alternative; a reduction of about 1,238 trips from the proposed project. Air quality emissions for this alternative were calculated by Terry A. Hayes Associates using URBEMIS 7G Output software. As shown in Table 34, above, daily operational emissions would be reduced as compared to the proposed project and less than significant for all criteria pollutant categories.

Land Use

The reduced density alternative would have similar land use impacts as compared to the proposed project. No improvements or changes in land uses would occur at the Civic Center Site. Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Metlox development would be substantially consistent with the City of Manhattan Beach General Plan and LCP Guidelines. While this alternative would be developed at a smaller scale, in terms of land use consistency and compatibility with existing uses, impacts would generally be the same as the proposed project.

Public Services (Police Protection)

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would include the construction of the Public Safety Facility. Therefore, the beneficial impacts of the Civic Center improvements would still occur. In terms of increased demands on police services, this alternative would have reduced impacts as compared to the proposed project. Because this alternative does not provide for any subterranean parking, security concerns associated with limited public visibility within the parking garage(s) would

be avoided. In addition, this alternative would generate less people to the site, which would act to reduce demands on police services to some extent. This alternative would have less than significant impacts upon police protection services and would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Risk of Upset

Impacts associated with hazardous materials and risk of upset would be the same under this alternative as compared to the proposed project. Potential impacts associates with releasing ACMs, lead based paint, or PCBs would be similar to the proposed project as the Civic Center buildings would be demolished and reconstructed under this alternative. The Metlox development will include the same type of land uses as proposed with the project. As such, the only potentially hazardous materials that may be used and/or stored on the Metlox site would include common household cleaners, solvents, paints, or lacquers. These chemicals would be removed from the structures prior to demolition and construction so as to avoid any accidental release or risk of upset from potentially hazardous substances. The associated risks of storing and or using such materials on site after construction is complete would be adequately reduced to acceptable levels of safety via continued compliance with federal, state and local regulations. Therefore, risk of upset would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Transportation/Circulation

As concluded in the Project Traffic Study, prepared by Crain & Associates, the Reduced Density Alternative would generate 2,204 net new weekday trips, with 47 inbound trips and 30 outbound trips during the AM peak hours, and 117 inbound and 164 outbound trips during the PM peak hours. During weekends, this alternative would generate an additional 2,360 daily trips, with approximately 136 inbound and 127 outbound trips during Saturday and Sunday peak hours. Based on these figures, it is anticipated that the Reduced Density Alternative would result in significant impacts at the following two intersections:

- Highland Avenue and 13th Street (Winter PM peak hour)
- Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Valley Drive/Ardmore Avenue (Summer weekdays AM & PM peak hours)

Evaluation of mitigation measures for these intersections was performed to determine their effectiveness. The following mitigation measures are recommended to reduce traffic impacts associated wit the Reduced Density Alternative:

- Highland Avenue & 13th Street -Install a two-phase signal at this intersection if warranted based on actual traffic counts taken after the project is developed. The implementation of peak-hour southbound left-turn restrictions at this intersection is another option to mitigate project impacts as this restriction would improve traffic flow through this intersection, as it would reduce northbound through and southbound left-turn conflicts, and allow for the free flow of southbound traffic. In addition, the conversion of 13th Street to a one-way eastbound scheme is another option.

- Manhattan Beach Blvd. & Valley Drive/Ardmore Ave. -Install a dual southbound left-turn lane at this intersection at such a time that two left turn lanes are warranted based on actual traffic counts.

After implementation of feasible mitigation improvements, a significant traffic impact is expected to remain at the following one intersection:

- Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Valley Drive/Ardmore Avenue (Summer weekdays, PM peak hour).

As compared to the project, which may result in significant unavoidable impacts this intersection as well as at Highland Avenue and Manhattan Beach Boulevard during the summer weekends (Sundays), the Reduced Density Alternative would avoid significant impacts at one intersection during summer weekends. Significant traffic impacts would be reduced, but not avoided under this alternative. A summary of traffic impacts under this alternative is provided in Table 39 on page 230.

Parking. As indicated previously, the Reduced Density Alternative will provide parking based on a shared parking demand analysis in a surface parking lot. Because of the reduction to the size of this project, the construction of a subterranean parking garage would not be feasible on the Metlox site. Parking under the Civic Center site would be provided as proposed under the project. Under this scenario, parking availability on the Civic Center site would be the same as the proposed project with a surplus of 44 spaces based on the City's 1995 shared parking demand for the Public Safety Facility. Using the shared parking demand methodology for the Reduced density Metlox development, the parking demand generated by this alternative would be proportionally reduced as compared to the proposed project. The project analysis estimates a peak demand of 528 parking spaces, with 306 being attributable to the Civic Center, and 222 attributable to the Metlox development. A 40 percent reduction to the Metlox parking demand would result in a total site demand of 439, with 133 attributable to the Metlox uses. With 350 parking spaces provided on the Civic Center site, the Reduced Density Alternative would need to provide approximately 89 parking spaces in a surface parking lot.

Table 35
Critical Movement Analysis Summary – Reduced Density Alternative

Intersection	Peak Hour	Without Alternative		With Reduced Density Alternative			With Reduced Density Alternative Plus Mitigation		
		CMA	LOS	CMA	LOS	Impact	CMA	LOS	Impact
Reduced Density Alternative – Winter Weekdays									
Highland Ave &13th Street	AM	0.864	D	0.870	D	0.006	0.696	B	-0.168
	PM	0.976	E	1.013	F	0.037*	0.811	D	-0.165
Manhattan Beach Blvd & Valley Dr. Ardmore Ave.	AM	0.703	C	0.711	C	0.008	0.671	B	-0.032
	PM	0.559	A	0.625	B	0.066	0.596	A	0.037
Reduced Density Alternative – Summer Weekdays									
Highland Ave &13th Street	AM	0.760	C	0.766	C	0.006	0.613	B	-0.147
	PM	0.769	C	0.807	D	0.038	0.645	B	-0.124
Manhattan Beach Blvd & Valley Dr. Ardmore Ave.	AM	0.973	E	1.029	F	0.056*	0.929	E	-0.044
	PM	1.003	F	1.041	F	0.038*	1.041	F	0.038*
Reduced Density Alternative – Summer Weekends									
Highland Ave &13th Street	SAT	0.770	C	0.802	D	0.032	0.642	B	-0.128
	SUN	0.707	C	0.739	C	0.032	0.591	B	-0.116
Manhattan Beach Blvd & Valley Dr. Ardmore Ave.	SAT	0.706	C	0.841	D	0.135	0.743	C	0.037
	SUN	0.836	D	0.899	D	0.063	0.878	D	0.042

* denotes significant impact.

Source: Crain & Associates, September 2000.

Hydrology/Water Quality

In terms of surface water runoff, hydrological impacts would generally be the same under this alternative as it would involve the same amount of impervious surface area. Because water quality impacts are generally tied to urban pollutants associated with surface parking lots, impacts would be roughly proportional to any changes in surface parking area. This alternative would result in a total of 236 surface parking spaces; 147 on the Civic Center lot and 89 on the Metlox property. Similar to the proposed project this would be a reduction in surface parking area, and a beneficial impact to water quality would result. Impacts would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Noise

Construction noise for this alternative would be generally the same as the proposed project. Although less construction will be required, noise levels generated by construction activities would be the same under either scenario. Similar to the proposed project, unavoidable significant noise impacts would occur on a temporary basis throughout the duration of the project construction phase.

Noise sources for this alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed project. Any difference in noise impacts during the operational phase would be closely tied to differences in traffic volumes on the surrounding roadways. As previously stated, this alternative would generate slightly fewer traffic impacts than the proposed project. Therefore, operational noise impacts associated with increased traffic volumes would be less than significant and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

VII. E. INCREASED PARKING ALTERNATIVE

The Increased Parking Alternative would include the proposed project exactly as proposed under the proposed project, for both the Civic Center and Metlox components, with an additional level of subterranean parking provided beneath the Metlox project site.

Under the proposed project, the Metlox site is anticipated to include the parking to meet demands based on a shared parking demand analysis. With the exception of approximately 20 on-street parking spaces that will be provided by making 13th Street a through street between Morningside Drive and Valley Drive, all of the Metlox parking will be provided in a subterranean parking garage. Based on shared parking demand calculations presented in the project Traffic Study, it is estimated that the combined Civic Center and Metlox development uses will have a peak demand of 528 parking spaces at any one time. The project currently proposes 562 spaces between the two developments, with 212 occurring on the Metlox property. Under this alternative, a second level of subterranean parking would be proposed under the Metlox site. As such, it is estimated that the total parking supplied on the Metlox site would be doubled, creating approximately 424 parking spaces on the Metlox Site alone. Altogether, a total of 774 parking spaces would be provided between the Civic Center and Metlox projects. Access driveways to the public parking garage will remain as proposed under the project with access driveways at Morningside Drive and Valley Drive. Roadway configurations and traffic patterns would also be altered as proposed under the project.

Environmental Impacts

Aesthetics

Impacts to views and aesthetics would be the same under this alternative as compared to the proposed project. The only change this alternative provides is a second level of subterranean parking, which would not affect the visual character of the project site from the street level.

Air Quality

Constructing a second level of subterranean parking would require additional grading and excavation activities. In addition to moving greater volumes of soil, this alternative would likely increase the duration of the construction period. As such, air quality impacts associated with construction activities would be increased. As indicated in the project analysis, construction impacts are anticipated generate PM10 emissions at a rate of 344 ppd. This amount would exceed the significance criteria thresholds of 150 ppm, resulting in significant PM10 impacts prior to mitigation. Implementation of mitigation measures, however, would substantially reduce PM10 emissions below significance levels to a level of

99 ppd. It is anticipated that this alternative would increase PM10 emissions, though not to a level that would remain significant after proper implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Assuming the same mitigation measures are applied, a doubling in PM10 levels after mitigation (i.e., PM10 emissions at 198 ppd) would exceed threshold levels and would result in a significant unavoidable air quality impact. Therefore, although PM10 impacts would be increased, impacts would still be less than significant.

Land Use

In terms of land use compatibility, consistency with the General Plan Land use designations, and FAR requirements, land use impacts would generally be the same under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

Public Safety (Police Protection)

Demands for police protection are anticipated to be increased under this alternative for reasons primarily associated with increased on-site parking. An increase in parking availability will likely attract additional visitors to the project site. The project analysis identified the parking garage as a concern for public safety. Accordingly, this impact will be increased with a second level of subterranean parking because, (1) more cars will be accessing the subterranean garage levels, and (2) there would be a larger area of public space with limited public visibility. Although concerns for public safety and associated demands upon police protection will be increased, these impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels with implementation of the project mitigation measures. Impacts would be less than significant, but increased as compared to the proposed project.

Risk of Upset. Impacts associated with potentially hazardous materials and risk of upset would be less than significant as they would be the same under this alternative as they would for the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation

Traffic. In terms of trip generation, traffic volumes generated by this alternative would likely be greater than the proposed project. While this alternative provides for the same size and type of development as the project, the availability of additional parking would attract additional visitors to the project site and Downtown Business District. It would be expected that visitors to the Downtown Business District and the Beach areas would utilize the parking structure. As such, this alternative would generate additional regional trips from areas outside the general project vicinity, witch is inconsistent with the project objectives. Impacts associated with traffic congestion on local roadways would thus be increased when compared to the proposed project. This alternative would likely increase the occurrence of unavoidable significant traffic impacts on nearby roadways.

Parking. It is expected that this alternative would provide a total of 350 parking spaces on the Civic Center Site (the same number proposed for the project) and 424 parking spaces on the Metlox site. A total of 774 parking spaces would be provided between the Civic Center and Metlox developments under this alternative. As indicated in Section V.F. Transportation and Circulation, the Code-required parking would be 628 parking spaces for the two development combined. This alternative would meet the code requirements and would provide surplus parking for the Downtown Business District.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Hydrology and water quality impacts would generally be the same under this alternative as estimated for the proposed project. Although increased vehicle trips are anticipated to be generated by the availability of surplus parking, such parking would be provided below grade and would not be subject to surface water runoff during storm events. No additional cars will be exposed to surface water runoff and impacts would be similar to the project.

Noise

Construction noise impacts under this alternative would be increased as a function of additional grading and excavation activities associated with constructing a larger subterranean parking garage. Construction noise would be generated on a temporary basis, though for a longer time period than estimated for the proposed project. This alternative would result in significant unavoidable noise impacts during the construction phase and impacts would be increased as compared to the proposed project.

Sources of noise for this alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed project. Any difference in noise impacts during the operational phase would be closely tied to differences in traffic volumes on the surrounding roadways. As this alternative is anticipated to generate more traffic than the proposed project, the resulting noise impacts would be increased. Project traffic levels are anticipated to increase ambient CNEL noise levels by 1dBA. A doubling of traffic volumes are generally needed to increase noise levels to perceptible levels (i.e., a 3dBA is the lowest decibel increase noticeable to the human ear under general conditions). While this alternative will likely increase traffic congestion, it is not expected to double the projected traffic volumes estimated for the proposed project. Therefore, noise increases under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project and are not expected to be significant.

VII. F. ALTERNATIVE MIXED-USE METLOX DEVELOPMENT

Under the Alternative Mixed Use Metlox Development, the Civic Center is proposed as defined for the proposed project and the Metlox development is proposed with an alternative mix of commercial uses. The floor area proposed under this alternative would be substantially similar to the proposed project (i.e., approximately 90,000 square feet). Generally, the difference in uses for this alternative involves an increase in commercial office space and a decrease in the amount of retail space as compared to the proposed project. The size and type of restaurant uses are similar to the proposed project. The alternative mix of commercial land uses is provided in Table 36 on page 223.

Access under this alternative would be the same as proposed under the project. Access to public parking will be provided via 15th Street and one location off of Valley Drive. The public driveway at 15th Street, adjacent to the City Hall Building, will provide access to surface parking, as well as access to below grade parking via a driveway ramp located within the interior of the surface parking lot. An additional subterranean parking driveway will be provided on 15th Street adjacent to the proposed Public Safety Facility for secured parking. The subterranean level will provide 116 secure parking spaces for Police/Fire functions and 87 spaces for Civic Center public and staff. The on-grade parking provides 61 secure spaces for Police/Fire and 86 spaces for Civic Center public and staff parking. The total number of spaces provided for the Civic Center is 350 (203 subterranean and 147 on-grade).

Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative will provide parking based on a shared use parking demand analysis. Parking will be provided by a subterranean parking garage as well as surface parking. It is estimated that a total of 212 spaces will be required. Access driveways to the parking garage will be provided via Morningside Drive and Valley Drive. Service and delivery vehicles will be able to access the site from Valley Drive, 13th Street, and Morningside Drive. Morningside Drive between Manhattan Beach Boulevard and 13th Street is proposed to be restricted to a one-way street to allow for northward bound traffic only to alleviate congestion at the intersection of Morningside Drive and Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

This Alternative would include a proposal to create a two-way thoroughfare on Valley Drive between 15th Street and 13th Street to alleviate congestion at the intersection of Valley Drive and Manhattan Beach Boulevard. Valley Drive currently provides two southbound only lanes in this vicinity. The project also includes the extension of 13th Street for vehicular traffic to provide through vehicular access from Highland Avenue to Valley Drive. This extension will include approximately 20 on-street parking spaces.

Table 36
Alternative Mixed-Use Metlox Development

Proposed Uses	Existing Development (sq. ft.)	Proposed Development (sq. ft.)	Net Increase (sq. ft.)
Civic Center Site			
Fire Department	10,568	57,000 (combined)	26,432
Police Department	20,000		
Public Library	12,100	30,000	17,900
Cultural Arts Center	0	10,000	10,000
Sub-Total	**42,668**	**97,000**	**54,332**
Metlox Development – Alternative Mixed Uses			
Restaurants	N/A	6,400	6,400
Retail (misc.)	N/A	15,900	15,900
Commercial Office	N/A	31,420	31,420
Day Spa	N/A	3,000	3,000
Inn (+/-40 rooms)	N/A	33,280	33,280
Sub-Total		**90,000**	**90,000**
TOTAL			**144,332**

Environmental Impacts

Aesthetics

The aesthetic characteristics of the proposed Metlox development are not expected to change under this alternative. The design features will still include one and two-story block style commercial structures centered around paseos and a Town Square. All of the building structures would remain as proposed under the project. All of the architectural features will be identical to the proposed project. However, commercial office space will be present in greater quantity and will occupy some ground level areas. The height and density of this alternative would be exactly the same as proposed under the proposed project. As such, impacts upon existing views would be less than significant and the same as the proposed project.

Air Quality

Air quality impacts are closely related to the amount and duration of the construction activities involved and vehicular traffic volumes. Since the size and scale of this alternative is similar to that proposed for the proposed project, construction impacts would be the same under either development scenario. Similar to the project impacts, air quality impacts would exceed threshold levels for PM10 emissions. Implementation of dust abatement methods such as watering the project site and ceasing grading activities during periods of high winds would be successful in reducing PM10 emissions to levels below the significance criteria. As such, no significant air quality impacts would occur under this alternative.

Operational air quality emissions are closely tied to vehicular traffic levels. As indicated in the project traffic study, the Mixed Use Metlox Development Alternative would result in a total of 3,122 net new weekday trips. Using URBEMIS7G modeling software, increased air pollutant emissions resulting from the Mixed-Use Alternative were determined. As presented in **Error! Reference source not found.** on page **Error! Bookmark not defined.**, air quality impact for this alternative would be less than the proposed project and below significance criteria levels. This alternative would result in air quality impacts that are less than significant and slightly reduced to the proposed project.

Land Use

The Alternative Mixed-Use Metlox Development Alternative would have similar land use impacts as compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative development would be substantially consistent with the City of Manhattan Beach General Plan and LCP Guidelines. In terms of land use consistency and compatibility with existing uses, impacts would generally be the same as the proposed project. Land use entitlements would still be in the form of a Development Agreement or a Master Use Permit. Land use impacts would be less than significant and the same as the proposed project.

Public Services (Police Protection)

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would include the construction of the Public Safety Facility. Therefore, the beneficial impacts of the Civic Center improvements would still occur. In terms of increased demands on police services, this alternative would have generally the same impacts on police services as compared to the proposed project. The configuration of the site plan with subterranean parking would be similar to the proposed project. This alternative would generate slightly fewer people to the site, which would act to reduce demands on police services to some extent. This alternative would have less than significant impacts upon police protection services and would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Table 37
Daily Operational Emissions – Alternative Mixed Use Metlox Development [1]

Project	Daily Trips	Pollutant			
		CO	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}
Proposed Project	3,442	195	22	39	22
Mixed-Use Alternative	3,122	177	20	35	20
SCAQMD Threshold		**550**	**55**	**55**	**150**
Exceed Threshold?		**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

[1] Daily emissions are expressed in pounds per day.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates, URBEMIS 7G Output results, October 2000.

Risk of Upset

Impacts associated with hazardous materials and risk of upset would be the same under this alternative as compared to the proposed project. Potential impacts associates with releasing ACMs, lead based paint, or PCBs would be similar to the proposed project as the Civic Center buildings would be demolished and reconstructed under this alternative. The Metlox development will include the same type of land uses as proposed with the project. As such, the only potentially hazardous materials that may be used and/or stored on the Metlox site would include common household cleaners, solvents, paints, or lacquers. These chemicals would be removed from the structures prior to demolition and construction so as to avoid any accidental release or risk of upset from potentially hazardous substances. The associated risks of storing and or using such materials on site after construction is complete would be adequately reduced to acceptable levels of safety via continued compliance with federal, state and local regulations. Therefore, risk of upset would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Transportation/Circulation

The Mixed Use Alternative would result in 3,122 net new weekday trips, with 100 inbound and 41 outbound trips occurring during the AM peak hour, and 145 inbound and 212 outbound trips during the PM peak hours. During weekends, the project would generate an additional 3,164 daily trips, with approximately 178 inbound and 166 outbound trips during Saturday and Sunday peak hours. This Alternative would result in significant traffic impacts at the following 3 intersections:

- Highland Avenue and 13th Street (Winter PM peak hour)
- Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Valley Drive/Ardmore Avenue (Summer AM & PM peak hours and Summer Sunday peak hours)
- Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard (Winter PM peak hour and Summer Sunday peak hours)

Evaluation of mitigation measures for these intersections was performed to determine their effectiveness. The following mitigation measures are recommended to reduce traffic impacts associated wit the Alternative Mixed Use Metlox Alternative:

- Highland Avenue & 13th Street -Install a two-phase signal at this intersection if warranted based on actual traffic counts taken after the project is developed. The implementation of peak-hour southbound left-turn restrictions at this intersection is another option to mitigate project impacts as this restriction would improve traffic flow through this intersection, as it would reduce northbound through and southbound left-turn conflicts, and allow for the free flow of southbound traffic. In addition, the conversion of 13th Street to a one-way eastbound scheme is another option.
- Manhattan Beach Blvd. & Valley Drive/Ardmore Ave. -Install a dual southbound left-turn lane at this intersection at such a time that two left turn lanes are warranted based on actual traffic counts.
- Manhattan Beach Blvd. & Sepulveda Blvd. -Contribute to the installation of dual left-turn lanes in the northbound and eastbound directions.

After implementation of feasible mitigation improvements, a significant traffic impact could remain at the following one intersection

- Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Valley Drive/Ardmore Avenue (Summer Weekdays PM peak hour).

As compared to the project, which may result in significant unavoidable impacts this intersection as well as at Highland Avenue and Manhattan Beach Boulevard during the summer weekends (Sundays), the Mixed Use Alternative would have slightly fewer impacts. However, a significant unavoidable traffic impact would still occur with this alternative. A summary of traffic impacts under this Alternative is provided in Table 38 on page 227.

Table 38
Critical Movement Analysis Summary – Alternative Mixed Use Metlox Alternative

Intersection	Peak Hour	Without Alternative		With Mixed Use Alternative			With Mixed Use Alternative Plus Mitigation		
		CMA	LOS	CMA	LOS	Impact	CMA	LOS	Impact
Alternative Mixed Use Metlox Alternative – Winter Weekdays									
Highland Ave &13th Street	AM	0.864	D	0.873	D	0.009	0.699	B	-0.165
	PM	0.976	E	1.026	F	0.050*	0.821	D	-0.155
Manhattan Beach Blvd & Valley Dr. Ardmore Ave.	AM	0.703	C	0.715	C	0.012	0.673	B	-0.030
	PM	0.559	A	0.644	B	0.085	0.606	B	0.047
Manhattan Beach Blvd & Sepulveda	AM	1.169	F	1.172	F	0.003	1.172	F	0.003
	PM	0.029	F	1.049	F	0.020*	1.023	F	-0.006
Alternative Mixed Use Metlox Alternative – Summer Weekdays									
Highland Ave &13th Street	AM	0.760	C	0.769	C	0.009	0.615	B	-0.145
	PM	0.769	C	0.819	D	0.050	0.655	B	-0.114
Manhattan Beach Blvd & Valley Dr. Ardmore Ave.	AM	0.973	E	1.039	F	0.066*	0.938	E	-0.035
	PM	1.003	F	1.051	F	0.048*	1.051	F	0.048*
Manhattan Beach Blvd & Sepulveda	AM	1.538	F	1.545	F	0.007	1.455	F	-0.083
	PM	1.741	F	1.757	F	0.016	1.620	F	-0.012
Alternative Mixed Use Metlox Alternative – Summer Weekends									
Highland Ave &13th Street	SAT	0.770	C	0.813	D	0.043	0.651	B	-0.119
	SUN	0.707	C	0.750	C	0.043	0.600	B	-0.107
Manhattan Beach Blvd & Valley Dr. Ardmore Ave.	SAT	0.706	C	0.862	D	0.156	0.759	C	0.053
	SUN	0.836	D	0.919	E	0.083*	0.890	D	0.054
Manhattan Beach Blvd & Sepulveda	SAT	1.094	F	1.113	F	0.019	0.969	E	-0.125
	SUN	1.104	F	1.124	F	0.020*	0.960	E	-0.144

* denotes significant impact.
Source: Crain & Associates, September 2000.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Water quality and hydrology impacts would be the same as the proposed project with implementation of this alternative. Both project scenarios involve developments of the same scale and would affect surface water runoff patterns the same. All pervious surface are that currently exists on-site would be converted to impervious area and would result in slight increase in surface water runoff. As stated for the proposed project, this increase could be accommodated by the existing storm water infrastructure. Under this alternative, water quality would also be affected in roughly the same manner as the project because the proposed uses are the same. The only differences to the mix of uses involves a redistribution of retail and commercial office space, neither of which contribute to waste water discharge. As such, hydrology and water quality impacts would be the same under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

Noise

This alternative would require the same degree of construction activities as the proposed project because both developments would be constructed at the same size and scale. As such, construction noise for this alternative would be the same as the proposed project. Unavoidable significant noise impacts would occur on a temporary basis throughout the duration of the project construction phase.

Sources of noise for this alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed project. Any difference in noise impacts during the operational phase would be closely tied to differences in traffic volumes on the surrounding roadways. As previously stated, this alternative would generate slightly fewer traffic impacts than the proposed project. Therefore, operational noise impacts associated with increased traffic volumes would be less than significant and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

VII. G. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In addition to the discussion of and comparison of environmental impacts of a proposed project and the alternatives, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA guidelines requires that an "environmentally superior" alternative be identified. The evaluation leading to the selection of the environmentally superior alternative involves consideration of the extent that the alternatives reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project, while not increasing the severity of the other environmental impacts analyzed in the EIR. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative which would be expected to generate the least amount of adverse impacts. Of the six alternatives analyzed in the EIR, the No Project Alternative would avoid all of the unavoidable significant impacts that would occur with development of the proposed project. On that basis, the No Project Alternative would be identified as the environmentally superior alternative. However, as provided by Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "if the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project' alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives." A summary matrix comparison of impacts resulting from each of the alternatives relative to impacts identified for the proposed project is provided in Table 39 on page 230. As depicted in Table 39 the Civic Center Only Alternative is the only project alternative that would avoid any of the significant adverse impacts that were identified for the proposed project. No intersections are anticipated to be significantly impacted with development of this project alternative. Significant unavoidable construction noise impacts would still be generated under this alternative.

Although the Civic Center Alternative would avoid significant traffic impacts, this alternative fails to meet any of the project's objectives associated with the Metlox site. Specifically, this alternative would only accomplish the project's objective to provide a Public Safety Facility which houses and coordinates the activities of the Police and Fire Departments in one facility. This alternative would only be successful in upgrading the existing police, fire, and public library services which have become outdated and inefficient in providing the spatial and functional needs demanded by their respective services. This alternative will not meet any of the project objectives directed towards redeveloping the former Metlox Potteries site and does not provide for any integration of the two sites. Moreover, this alternative fails to integrate the Civic Center site and the Metlox site with the rest of the Downtown Commercial Business District. This alternative does not provide any solution for redeveloping the Metlox site. To this extent, the environmentally superior alternative temporarily avoids any of the environmental impacts associated with redevelopment of the Metlox site.

Table 39
Comparison of Project and Alternatives Impacts

Environmental Issues	Proposed Project	No Project	Civic Center Only	Metlox Only	Reduced Density	Increased Parking	Alternative Mixed Uses
Aesthetics	LS	LS (+/-)	LS (+/-)	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Air Quality	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)	SU (+)	LS (-)
Land Use	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Public Services (Police Protection)	LS	LS (+/-)	LS (-)	LS (+)	LS (-)	LS (+)	LS (-)
Risk of Upset	LS	LS (-)	LS (=)	LS (-)	LS (=)	LS (+)	LS (=)
Transportation/Circulation	SU	LS (-)	LS (-)	SU (=)	SU (-)	SU (+)	SU (-)
Hydrology/Water Quality	LS	LS (+)	LS (-)	LS (+)	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Noise	SU	LS (-)	SU (-)	SU (-)	SU (-)	SU (+)	SU (-)

Notes:

The alternatives evaluation assumes net impacts following implementation of project mitigation measures, as applicable.

LS = A Less than Significant impact will occur.

SU = A Significant Unavoidable Impact will occur.

(+) = Impacts would be greater than the proposed project.

(-) = Impacts would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

(+/-) Impacts would be mixed. While some of the project's negative impacts would be reduced, other negative impacts would be created or beneficial impacts would be compromised.