

Section 5

Alternatives

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq.) require that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)). If mitigation measures or a feasible project alternative that would meet most of the basic project objectives would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of a proposed project, then the lead agency should not approve the proposed project unless it determines that specific technological, economic, social, or other considerations make the mitigation measures and the project alternative infeasible (PRC Section 21002, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)). The EIR must also identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and should briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c)).

One of the alternatives that must be analyzed is the “No Project” Alternative. The “No Project” analysis must discuss the existing conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved and development continued to occur in accordance with existing plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)). Therefore, pursuant with the CEQA Guidelines, this section discusses and analyzes a No Project alternative.

In addition to the No Project alternative, this section provides two additional alternatives (No SW-Sealed alternative and No Additional SW alternative) to the Preferred Project and analyzes the impacts of each. This section later provides a description of the alternatives and compares the significant impacts of the alternatives to the significant environmental impacts of the Preferred Project.

5.2 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

As stated above, the alternatives to a proposed project are meant to feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening its significant impacts. With one exception, all of the Preferred Project’s biological resources and hydrology/water quality significant impacts can be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures. The one remaining significant and unavoidable project-specific impact from the Preferred Project would be flooding from storm drain overflows (Impact HYD-6). When water is unable to discharge to the Bay, water backs up into the Strawberry and Potter Street storm drain lines, eventually spilling from drain inlets or manholes. As part of the Preferred Project, stormwater would not be allowed to drain to the

Aquatic Park lagoons from the Strawberry and Potter Street storm drain lines. During larger storm events (2-year event and greater), this would create stormwater loads upgradient of the project site that would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system by prohibiting discharge into Aquatic Park, causing an increase in upstream flooding, including onto West Berkeley streets.

Alternative 1: No Stormwater – Sealed Manholes (No SW-Sealed)

The No SW-Sealed alternative is identical to the Preferred Project with respect to the proposed circulatory infrastructure improvements to the Aquatic Park lagoons, storm drain modifications, and habitat improvements as the Preferred Project. However, the No SW-Sealed alternative would seal the manholes along the Potter Street storm drain line in order to prevent increased flooding in the lower portion of the Aquatic Park watershed.

Alternative 2: No Additional Stormwater (No Additional SW)

The APIP Technical Report recommended Alternative 4B as the preferred alternative for the hydrologic component of the APIP. For the purposes of this Draft EIR, Alternative 4B is designated as No Additional SW. The No Additional SW alternative would include the same circulatory infrastructure improvements to the Aquatic Park lagoons, storm drain modifications, and habitat improvements as the Preferred Project; however, this alternative proposes a different stormwater management regime than the Preferred Project or the No SW-Sealed alternative. Under the No Additional SW alternative, the slide gates on the storm drains would remain open during dry periods to facilitate tidal exchange, and would close upon initiation of flow in the upstream storm drains. However, the gates to the lagoons could re-open during storm events equal to or larger than the 2-year storm that would threaten to cause increased flooding upstream.

In addition, the No Additional SW alternative would include an adaptive management component that would allow for flexibility in stormwater management strategies as ecosystem monitoring and performance are evaluated. The following adaptive management strategies would be included in the No Additional SW alternative:

1. Prior to implementing the water circulation improvements, a water and sediment quality characterization study of the Main Lagoon would be completed. This study will establish the baseline conditions in the system and allow long-term comparison with post-project conditions. Sediment quality characterization involves collecting sediment samples from a variety of locations in each lagoon. The samples would be analyzed for sediment grain size (sand vs. mud), bulk chemistry (presence and concentrations of contaminants), and bioassays (acute toxicity of sediment and/or elutriate to typical marine invertebrate test organisms). Because most persistent urban contaminants, such as heavy metals, PCBs, DDT, and oil and gas (PAHs), are transported into tidal areas on clay particles, nearshore estuarine areas have greater contaminant levels in sediments rather than the water column. The sediment characterization study would provide the baseline for comparison with future tests and a determination of the efficacy of the water circulation improvements.

2. Water quality monitoring of the lagoon system would be performed using continuous monitoring devices to track basic indicators - temperature, dissolved oxygen, salinity, and pH. In addition, a number of other parameters should be measured less frequently including nutrients (nitrate, ammonia, total phosphorus), organophosphate pesticides, total dissolved solids (TDS), total suspended sediment (TSS), a range of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), PCBs, metals and trace elements, coliform, and chlorophyll to evaluate algal growth. Water quality monitoring should be done to characterize summer/fall conditions under the current system once the Preferred Project's hydrologic component is implemented.
3. Baseline and on-going monitoring would also include characterization of the benthic invertebrates that inhabit various areas of the lagoons. The diversity and abundance of invertebrates provides an indicator for the ecological health of the lagoon system. Worms, mollusks and crustaceans would be expected to live in the intertidal and subtidal mud layers. The diversity, abundance and distribution of these animals would be characterized as a baseline condition, and then at annual intervals as part of the lagoon-monitoring program.
4. The Preferred Project's water circulation improvements and their predicted outcomes are based on a detailed computer model of the watershed and lagoon system. The model has field data to describe the system and simulate the complex of fresh and tidal water flows into and out of the system. However, no model perfectly simulates real world conditions. Therefore, once the hydrologic component of the Preferred Project is completed, monitoring of water levels and water quality is recommended. The system would be built to allow slide gates to be installed on the various inlet/outlet connections to change tidal flow direction or levels if needed.
5. Detailed pre-project and post-project monitoring would be used to evaluate the effects on the aquatic habitat of various settings of the gates on the tide connections. The monitoring results for salinity at surface and at depth and other water quality parameters, along with the extent and abundance of the invertebrate communities in the lagoons, would indicate the overall health of the aquatic habitat and the need for management changes. An independent Technical Advisory Committee composed of concerned scientists and agencies would be charged with evaluating this monitoring data to determine if the water gate settings for the lagoons should be changed.
6. For the upland habitat areas, adaptive management practices would be used in revising revegetation and replanting practices and/or species. Monitoring of planting success would be performed, recording growth/density measurements along with location, irrigation volumes, wind exposure, sun/shade conditions, and noting whether protective hardware and/or weed mat was used. This information can be used to guide replanting efforts and choice of species as the revegetation project progresses.
7. A final level of adaptive management would review the success of first step efforts to control human and unleashed dog disturbance to habitat areas. The habitat areas should be photographed regularly and inspected for dog tracks. If signs and periodic enforcement do not decrease disturbance from unleashed dogs, the next step of fencing the areas may need to be implemented. The success of efforts to reduce homeless encampments and any other activities

that are used to reduce habitat disturbance should be reviewed no less frequently than yearly and revised as needed to increase effectiveness.

Alternative 3: No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, Aquatic Park would remain unchanged. The existing infrastructure that allows inter-lagoon circulation, exchange with the Bay, and inflow and outflow through the Potter Street and Strawberry storm drain lines would remain as-is. In addition, no wetland or habitat restoration would take place under this alternative. The Aquatic Park lagoons would continue to function as they do under existing conditions.

5.3 ATTAINMENT OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES

As described in Section 3, Project Description, the City has identified the following project objectives that are relevant to the physical impacts considered in this document:

1. Improve water quality and habitat at Aquatic Park while maintaining the balance of recreational uses and habitat areas.
2. Eliminate or reduce inflow of stormwater to Aquatic Park lagoon system to the extent feasible consistent with objective 1, above.
3. Improve park aesthetics.
4. Maximize eligibility of funding by outside sources.
5. Comply with all current codes and standards, regulations, orders, and policies.
6. Avoid increases in upstream flooding.

An evaluation of how each alternative meets or does not meet the basic project objectives is provided below. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), the following analysis describes the extent to which the three project alternatives meet or do not meet the City's objectives as described in Section 3, Project Description, and listed above.

Alternative 1: No SW-Sealed

The No SW-Sealed alternative would be identical to the Preferred Project in terms of water infrastructure improvements, habitat and recreation improvements, and on-going monitoring and maintenance. However, because this alternative would seal manholes along the lower Potter line storm drain system, storm drain overflows would occur higher in the Potter Street and Ashby Street corridors, further above the railroad crossing, thereby conflicting with Objective 6.

Alternative 2: No Additional SW

The No Additional SW alternative would include all of the physical improvements identified for the Preferred Project and would differ only in the management of stormwater flows into the Aquatic Park

lagoons. As described above, the No Additional SW alternative would continue the current management practices and would allow stormwater to enter the lagoons during the 2-year storm event and larger events. This alternative would include an adaptive management component that would allow for flexibility in stormwater management strategies as ecosystem monitoring and performance are evaluated. Therefore, the No Additional SW alternative would meet all of the project objectives, but would not completely eliminate the inflow of stormwater to the Aquatic Park lagoon system from the Potter Street and Strawberry storm drains, and some upstream flooding from storm drain overflows would still occur.

Alternative 3: No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative would not achieve the basic project objectives. The No Project Alternative would not meet the primary objectives of improving tidal exchange, water circulation, and water quality in the Aquatic Park lagoon system. Aquatic Park would continue to receive first-flush stormwater inflows carrying higher concentrations of pollutants from the upper watershed, which has an adverse effect on water quality in the lagoon system. Furthermore, the wetland and habitat restoration components of the Preferred Project would not be implemented.

5.4 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

This section evaluates whether the alternatives would reduce the significant impacts of the Preferred Project to less-than-significant levels and/or would generate impacts other than those identified for the Preferred Project. Recommended mitigation measures for each alternative are provided in the analysis below.

The comparative analysis of potential effects on biological resources for the No SW-Sealed and the No Additional SW alternatives is presented in summary form because the impacts would generally be limited to construction, the elements of which would be identical to the Preferred Project. For hydrology and water quality, there are differences in water quality and flooding/drainage impacts. Therefore, the impact analyses are presented in detail. For each hydrology/water quality impact, a separate impact numbering scheme is used to distinguish the impacts from the Preferred Project and between the two alternatives. For example, A1-HYD-1 corresponds to Preferred Project Impact HYD-1 for the No SW-Sealed alternative (Alternative 1).

Alternative 1: No SW-Sealed

As described above, the No SW-Sealed alternative would include all the project components identified for the Preferred Project, and would also include sealed manhole covers along the Potter Street storm drain line. Similar to the Preferred Project, it was determined that the No SW-Sealed alternative would have a less-than-significant impact with regard to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A1-HYD-1 Construction of the No SW-Sealed alternative could potentially violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (i.e., as established by the San Francisco Bay office of the Water Board or RWQCB). (PS)

The potential construction-related impacts of the No SW-Sealed alternative would be the same as for the Preferred Project. Short-term construction-phase impacts would pose a **potentially significant** threat to water quality. Implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1.1 through HYD-1.4 from Section 4.3, Hydrology and Water Quality, would reduce potential short-term construction-phase impacts to water quality to a **less-than-significant** level.

A1-HYD-2 Operation of the No SW-Sealed alternative would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (i.e., as established by the San Francisco Bay office of the Water Board or RWQCB). (PS)

Water Quality in the Lagoon. The potential impact of this alternative would be the same as for the Preferred Project, except that sealing manholes on the lower Potter line storm drain system would displace the overflows and spills from storm drains and manholes to higher elevations in the Potter Street and Ashby Street neighborhoods, further above the railroad tracks. Thus, overland flows would travel longer distances through West Berkeley and potentially mobilize slightly more pollutants before flowing into the Aquatic Park lagoons. However, this situation would occur less frequently than the Preferred Project because sealing the manholes would force the water to rise uphill before it spilled from the manholes. If the manholes were sealed (i.e., the Preferred Project), it would take a slightly larger and slightly less frequent storm event before overflows occurred. The pollutant loads would still be diluted by a large volume of overland flow runoff; therefore, the potential impact to lagoon water quality would be **less than significant**, similar to the Preferred Project.

Water Quality in the Central Bay. The potential water quality impact of this alternative would be the same as for the Preferred Project. The slight increase in the frequency and mass loadings of pollutants in runoff from small storms discharged to the Bay would be a **less-than-significant** impact. Overland runoff from overflows associated with larger events, such as the 2-year storm, would occur only infrequently and the slight increase in pollutant loads entering the Bay would still be diluted by a large volume of runoff. This would also be a **less-than-significant** impact, similar to the Preferred Project.

Groundwater Impacts. Potential impacts on groundwater quality would be the same as described for the Preferred Project. Any increase in salinity would be less-than-significant. Thus, any increase in salinity in the aquifer resulting from implementation of the No SW-Sealed alternative would be **less than significant**.

A1-HYD-3 The No SW-Sealed alternative would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted). (NI)

The No SW-Sealed alternative would not result in groundwater extraction that could lead to depletion of existing groundwater supplies or interference with neighboring wells. There are no concerns related to groundwater extraction as there are no existing wells on the project site, and none are proposed as part of this alternative. With regard to potential impacts related to impervious surface cover and groundwater recharge, the No SW-Sealed alternative would remove asphalt from abandoned parking areas and replant upland areas with vegetation, thereby decreasing impervious cover. These actions could increase recharge slightly, but only within the strip of land between the western shore of Aquatic Park and I-80, and not in the aquifer underlying the coastal plain. Implementation of the No SW-Sealed alternative would have **no impact** on groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge, identical to the Preferred Project.

A1-HYD-4 The No SW-Sealed alternative would alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site and surrounding area, and would increase the amount of circulation within the Aquatic Park lagoon system, which could result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. (PS)

Increased Shoreline Erosion Due to Higher Water Levels During Storms. Modeling results estimate that implementation of the No SW-Sealed alternative would result in lower maximum water surface elevations in the Main Lagoon and the Model Yacht Basin during a 2-year storm event, as compared to existing conditions (Table 5-1). Shoreline erosion would not increase because the banks of the Main Lagoon are protected by the rocky shoreline, and the Model Yacht Basin is lined by rock terraces. Therefore, the No SW-Sealed alternative would have **no impact** on increased shoreline erosion, and the impact on shoreline erosion would be avoided, when compared to the Preferred Project.

**Table 5-1
Comparison of Project Alternatives for the 2-Year Storm Event Modeling Results**

	Existing	Preferred Project	No Additional SW	No SW-Sealed
Main Lagoon, water surface elevation (ft)	-0.15	0.00	0.32	-0.33
Model Yacht Basin, water surface elevation (ft)	3.13	0.00	0.32	-0.33
Total spill volume in developed areas (acre-ft)	60	64	60	89
Total direct inflow volume to ML and MYB (acre-ft)	136	94	115	32

Source: Balance Hydrologics, 2012.

Increased Sediment Deposition and Need for Maintenance Dredging. No SW-Sealed alternative would have the same effect on sediment deposition as described for the Preferred

Project in Section 4.3, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would have a *potentially significant* impact on sediment deposition. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-4.1 would reduce potential impacts on sediment deposition and accumulation to a *less-than-significant* level, similar to the Preferred Project.

Increased Siltation or Turbidity Due to Mobilization of Previously Deposited Sediment. Similar to the Preferred Project, the temporary disturbance and redistribution of fine sediments stored in the lagoons would be a *less-than-significant* impact.

Increased Soil Erosion from Stormwater Runoff. Although the No SW-Sealed alternative would prevent overflows from the lower portions of the Potter line by sealing manhole covers, overflows higher in the Potter and Ashby Street corridors, in the more developed portions of West Berkeley would increase by 57 percent, from 60 acre-feet under existing conditions to 94 acre-feet (Table 4.3-7). The increased potential for soil erosion as these uncontrolled flows are discharged to the lagoon in a concentrated fashion without energy dissipation would be a *potentially significant* impact. The No SW-Sealed alternative would result in a greater potential for increased soil erosion from stormwater runoff than the Preferred Project. Additional mitigation beyond that required for the Preferred Project would be required. Implementation of Mitigation Measure A1-HYD-4.1 would reduce potential impacts on erosion of the lagoon banks to a *less-than-significant* level.

A1-HYD-4.1 Overland Stormwater Controls. Should the City chose to implement the No SW-Sealed option, energy dissipation (e.g., riprap or other hardened ground) shall be installed at locations bordering the Aquatic Park where overland flows currently enter the lagoons following spills from the upgradient storm drain systems.

A1-HYD-5 The No SW-Sealed alternative could result in flooding on- or off-site. (PS)

Flooding from Tidal events. The risk of off-site flooding under this alternative would be identical to that described for the Preferred Project in Section 4.3, Hydrology and Water Quality. Therefore, implementation of the No SW-Sealed alternative would have a *potentially significant* impact related to flooding from tidal events. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-5.1 as described in Section 4.3, Hydrology and Water Quality, would ensure that further analysis of other tidal events (e.g., the 100-year tide) across all of the basins be completed during project design to identify operating parameters for the slide gates, which would reduce this potentially significant impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

\Flooding from Large Storm Events. Modeling results indicate that implementation of the No SW-Sealed alternative would result in a decrease in maximum water surface elevations resulting from the 2- and 100-year flood events within the Main Lagoon and Model Yacht Basin, relative to existing conditions (see Table 5-1 and Table 5-2). Therefore, the No SW-

Sealed alternative would have a *less-than-significant impact* on flooding in Aquatic Park from large storm events, similar to the Preferred Project.

**Table 5-2
Comparison of Project Alternatives for 100-Year Flood Event Modeling Results**

	Existing	Preferred Project	No Additional SW	No SW-Sealed
Main Lagoon Water Surface Elevation (ft)	4.65	3.55	4.65	1.49
Model Yacht Basin Water Surface Elevation (ft)	4.65	3.55	4.65	1.49
Total Spill Volume in Developed Acres (af)	361	367	361	478
Total Direct Inflow Volume to Main Lagoon and Model Yacht Basin (af)	499	365	497	104

Source: Balance, 2012.

Flooding from a Series of Storms. The No SW-Sealed alternative would include the same circulation infrastructure improvements and slide gates as the Preferred Project. Therefore, the No SW-Sealed alternative would provide the same ability to block inflows to the Aquatic Park lagoons and the same increased capacity to rapidly flush the lagoons (outflow) after a storm event as described for the Preferred Project, and, like the Preferred Project, impacts would be *less than significant*. As with the Preferred Project, the No SW-Sealed alternative would also result in a benefit regarding the increased resilience of Aquatic Park to withstand flooding from multiple storm events.

Flooding due to Mechanical Failure of the Slide Gates. The No SW-Sealed alternative would include the same remotely-controlled slide gates in the Strawberry and Potter Street storm drain lines as the Preferred Project. As such, this alternative could result in flooding related to mechanical failure of the slide gates, as described for the Preferred Project. Identical to the Preferred Project, an operation, maintenance, and monitoring (OMM) plan would be prepared in conjunction with design of the gate controls. The OMM plan would include measures for design of the slide gate mechanisms so that they are normally open and can be forced open if a failure in the operating mechanism occurs; placement of sensors which confirm the positions of the slide gates and communicate that information to a central control station; periodic, scheduled inspection, testing, and maintenance of the gates; and periodic, scheduled testing of the control system, communications, and functionality of the slide gate operating mechanisms. Therefore, the potential for flooding to occur as a result of mechanical failure of the slide gates would be *less than significant*.

A1-HYD-6 The No SW-Sealed alternative would have the potential to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (SU)

Flooding from Storm Drain Overflows. The No SW-Sealed alternative would eliminate the inflow of stormwater to the Aquatic Park lagoons during all storm events. When runoff from moderate-sized events is unable to discharge to the Bay, water backs up into the Strawberry and Potter Street storm drain lines, eventually spilling from drain inlets or manholes. Sealing manholes would prevent overflows from the downstream portions of the Potter line, but would increase overflows from the storm drains higher in the Potter Street and Ashby Street corridors, in more developed portions of West Berkeley. Modeled overflow volumes would increase from 60 acre-feet under existing conditions to 89 acre-feet (29 acre-feet) during the 2-year flood event, and from 361 acre-feet to 478 acre-feet (117 acre-feet) during the 100-year flood event. The No SW-Sealed alternative would result in a greater increase in storm drain overflow than the Preferred Project. These potential increases in flooding would be *significant and unavoidable* given the fact that the required improvements to avoid it would be cost prohibitive, as discussed in Section 4.3, Hydrology and Water Quality.

A1-HYD-7 The No SW-Sealed alternative would not otherwise degrade water quality. (NI)

There are no additional potential impacts related to water quality beyond those discussed and addressed above under Impacts A1-HYD-1 and A1-HYD-4 above. Therefore, implementation of the No SW-Sealed alternative would not otherwise degrade water quality, resulting in *no impact*, identical to the Preferred Project.

A1-HYD-8 The No SW-Sealed alternative would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. (NI)

No additional housing or other habitable structures would be placed within a FEMA defined 100-year flood hazard area as part of the No SW-Sealed alternative, resulting in *no impact*, identical to the Preferred Project.

A1-HYD-9 The No SW-Sealed alternative would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. (LTS)

No structures that would impede or redirect flood flows would be placed within the 100-year flood hazard area by the No SW-Sealed alternative.

Under the No SW-Sealed alternative, a channel would be cut through the berm separating the Model Yacht Basin from the Main Lagoon, changing the movement of storm flows through the basin and lagoon. In addition, a bioswale would be constructed immediately west of Bolivar Drive East, detaining and redirecting surface stormwater flows into the Main Lagoon. These actions would result in improvement in flood flow management, water

quality in the lagoon and basin, and reduced contaminant loadings to the lagoon. The impact of any of this alternative on flood flows would be *less than significant* and no mitigation would be required, identical to the Preferred Project.

Because this alternative would place fill in a Special Flood Hazard Area – a floodplain – the City of Berkeley Floodplain Administrator (Public Works Director) would need to determine whether CLOMR or CLOMR-F permits will need to be processed through the City of Berkeley and FEMA. The No SW-Sealed alternative would also be subject to Berkeley Municipal Code, Title 17- Water and Sewers, Chapter 12- Flood Zone Development.

AI-HYD-10 The No SW-Sealed alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. (NI)

Aquatic Park is within a dam failure inundation area, as determined by the State Office of Emergency Services (OES). The No SW-Sealed alternative would not alter the nature of this potential flooding impact. Therefore, identical to the Preferred Project, this alternative would not expose people or structures to hazards related to flooding as a result of dam failure, resulting in *no impact*.

AI-HYD-11 The No SW-Sealed alternative could expose people or structures to substantial risk of inundation by sea level rise. (PS)

Impact HYD-5 discusses the potential impacts of this alternative on flooding, which are the same as for the Preferred Project except that sealing manholes in the lower portions of the Potter line storm drain systems would result in the spills and overflows occurring higher in the Potter Street and Ashby Street corridors. As described for the Preferred Project in Section 4.3, Hydrology and Water Quality, sea level rise would further increase the frequency and magnitude of such stormwater overflows, resulting in a *potentially significant* impact that could be greater in magnitude than the Preferred Project because overflows would be higher in the Potter and Ashby streets corridors. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-5.1 would ensure that this alternative is designed to reduce impacts associated with tidal inundation to a *less-than-significant* level.

AI-HYD-12 The No SW-Sealed alternative would not expose people or structures to substantial risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. (LTS)

Inundation from Seiche. Identical to the Preferred Project described in Section 4.3, Hydrology and Water Quality, the No SW-Sealed alternative would have a *less-than-significant* impact on the response to a seiche within the lagoon system.

Inundation from Tsunami. Identical to the Preferred Project described in Section 4.3, Hydrology and Water Quality, the net impact of the No SW-Sealed alternative on tsunami-caused flooding would be *less-than-significant*.

Inundation from Mudflows. The area immediately up-gradient from Aquatic Park is gently sloped and not under threat of mudflows. This would not change under the No SW-Sealed alternative. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would have *no impact* on the potential for inundation from mudflows in the project area, identical to the Preferred Project.

Biological Resources

Implementation of the No SW-Sealed alternative would have similar effects on biological resources as those described for the Preferred Project. As described in Section 4.2, Biological Resources, database queries and site visits did not identify any special status or listed plant or animal species. Therefore, the No SW-Sealed alternative would not have a substantial adverse impact on such species. The No SW-Sealed alternative would include the same storm drain infrastructure modifications, tide tube improvements, and habitat restoration efforts as evaluated for the Preferred Project. Therefore, the No SW-Sealed alternative would result in the same construction-related impacts to riparian habitat, aquatic habitat, wetlands, and other sensitive natural areas at the project site, similar to the Preferred Project, and mitigation measures identified for the Preferred Project to reduce potentially significant impacts would also be required (Mitigation Measures BR-3.1, BR-6.1, BR-6.2, and BR-7.1).

The No SW-Sealed alternative would limit all storm drain outflows into the project site lagoons and would seal the manholes upgradient of the project site. The manholes would be left unsealed under the Preferred Project. By sealing manholes, stormwater would overflow further upgradient in the storm drain system. Thus, overland flows would travel longer distances and potentially mobilize slightly more pollutants before flowing into the Aquatic Park lagoons. However, this situation would occur less frequently than the Preferred Project (for the reasons explained in Impact A1-HYD-2), and the pollutant loads would still be diluted by a large volume of overland flow runoff. Therefore, the No SW-Sealed alternative could result in an overall benefit to water quality, that, in turn, would lead to improved aquatic habitat, similar to the Preferred Project.

The No SW-Sealed alternative would adhere to the City Municipal Code provisions governing the protection of the project site as important wildlife habitat and the removal of trees and shrubs. The No SW-Sealed alternative would also comply with the City's Live Oak Protection Ordinance, similar to the Preferred Project. Therefore, the No SW-Sealed alternative would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, resulting in a *less-than-significant* impact, similar to the Preferred Project.

Alternative 2: No Additional SW

As described above, the No Additional SW alternative would include all the project components identified for the Preferred Project (infrastructure and habitat improvements), but would involve a different stormwater management regime. In comparison with the Preferred Project and No SW-Sealed (Alternative 1), which propose to inhibit all stormwater from entering the Aquatic Park lagoons via the Strawberry and Potter Street storm drains, the No Additional SW alternative would result in no additional stormwater (over existing conditions) from entering the lagoons. Similar to the Preferred

Project, it was determined that the No Additional SW alternative would have a less-than-significant impact with regard to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A2-HYD-1 Construction of the No Additional SW alternative could potentially violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (i.e., as established by the San Francisco Bay office of the Water Board or RWQCB). (PS)

The potential construction-related impacts of the No Additional Stormwater alternative would be the same as for the Preferred Project. Short-term construction-phase impacts could pose a *potentially significant* threat to water quality. Implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1.1 through HYD-1.4 from Section 4.3, Hydrology and Water Quality, would reduce potential short-term construction-phase impacts to water quality to a *less-than-significant* level.

A2-HYD-2 Operation of the No Additional SW alternative would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (i.e., as established by the San Francisco Bay office of the Water Board or RWQCB). (LTS)

Water Quality in the Lagoon. Implementation of the No Additional SW alternative would include the same primary drainage components as described for the Preferred Project in Section 4.3, Hydrology and Water Quality. However, under this alternative, the slide gates would be opened during the large storms (2-year to 100-year storms) to allow runoff to enter the lagoons, as opposed to the Preferred Project and No SW-Sealed in which the slide gates would remain closed during all storm events. This would reduce the amount of stormwater entering the Aquatic Park lagoons from storm drains during small storms, and would increase the amount of runoff directed into the lagoons from larger events, such as the 2-year storm. On balance (by design), the same amount of runoff would enter the lagoons after implementation of the No Additional SW alternative as enters them now. However, the timing of runoff entry would change such that pollutants would be at maximum dilution, which would reduce the impact on water quality in the lagoon as compared to existing conditions and the Preferred Project and No SW-Sealed alternative. Like the Preferred Project, impacts would be *less than significant*, but this alternative could result in an overall benefit to water quality in the Aquatic Park lagoons compared to the Preferred Project.

Water Quality in the Central Bay. During larger storm events the tidal gates would re-open to allow a portion of peak flows to enter the basin and lagoon, resulting in an increase in the amount of runoff directed into the Aquatic Park lagoons, as compared to the Preferred Project and No SW-Sealed alternative. Further, because the No Additional SW

alternative would allow peak flows to enter the project site lagoons, this alternative would reduce the amount of polluted runoff entering the Bay during larger storm events compared to the Preferred Project and No SW-Sealed alternative. Therefore, during larger storm events, the No Additional SW alternative would have *no impact* on water quality in the Bay, which could be a benefit of this alternative.

Groundwater Impacts. Potential impacts on groundwater quality are the same as for the previous Preferred Project and No SW-Sealed alternative. Specifically, any increase in aquifer salinity resulting from implementation of the No Additional SW alternative would be *less than significant*, similar to the Preferred Project.

A2-HYD-3 The No Additional SW alternative would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted). (NI)

Similar to the Preferred Project, the No Additional SW alternative would have *no impact* on groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge.

A2-HYD-4 The No Additional SW alternative would alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site and surrounding area, and would increase the amount of circulation within the Aquatic Park lagoon system, which could result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. (PS)

Increased Shoreline Erosion Due to Higher Water Levels During Storms. Modeling results estimate that implementation of the No Additional SW option would result in an approximate 0.5-foot increase in the maximum water surface elevations in the Main Lagoon resulting from the 2-year storm event (Table 5-1). Similar to the Preferred Project, it is unlikely that the minor increase in wave heights that would result from the No Additional SW alternative would substantially increase shoreline erosion. Therefore, the No Additional SW alternative would have a *less-than-significant* impact on shoreline erosion.

Increased Sediment Deposition and Need for Maintenance Dredging. Similar to the previous the Preferred Project, implementation of the No Additional SW alternative would have a potentially significant impact on sediment deposition. However, the No Additional SW alternative would adhere to the same mitigation measure as the Preferred Project (Mitigation Measure HYD-4.1). Therefore, impacts related to increased sediment deposition would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level.

Increased Siltation or Turbidity Due to Mobilization of Previously Deposited Sediment. The temporary disturbance and redistribution of fine sediments stored in the lagoons would be a *less-than-significant* impact, similar to the Preferred Project.

Increased Soil Erosion from Stormwater Runoff. Under the No Additional SW alternative, the magnitude of overflows from the Strawberry and Potter storm drain systems would remain unchanged from the existing condition (Table 5-2). Therefore, implementation of the No Additional SW alternative would have *no impact* on increased soil erosion from stormwater runoff.

A2-HYD-5 The No Additional SW alternative could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the Aquatic Park lagoon system circulation infrastructure and stormwater conveyance system, which would result in flooding on- or off-site. (PS)

Flooding from Tidal Events. The risk of flooding from tidal events under this alternative would be identical to that presented for the Preferred Project and the No SW-Sealed alternative. Therefore, implementation of the No Additional SW alternative would have a potentially significant impact related to flooding from tidal events. However, the No Additional SW alternative would adhere to the same mitigation measure as identified for the Preferred Project (Mitigation Measure HYD-5.1). Therefore, impacts related to flooding from tidal events would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level.

Flooding from Large Storms. Modeling results indicate that the maximum water surface elevation resulting from the 2-year storm event would increase relative to existing conditions within the Main Lagoon, but not to the level of the lowest-lying adjacent structure (see Table 5-1). Within the Model Yacht Basin, the maximum water surface elevation during the 2-year storm is estimated to decrease relative to existing conditions. Maximum water surface elevations resulting from the 100-year flood event would remain unchanged from levels under existing conditions (see Table 5-2). Therefore, the No Additional SW alternative would have *no impact* related to flooding from large storm events.

Flooding from a Series of Storms. The No Additional SW alternative would include the same circulation infrastructure improvements and slide gates as the Preferred Project. Therefore, the No SW-Sealed alternative would provide the same ability to block inflows to the Aquatic Park lagoons and increased capacity to rapidly flush the lagoons after a storm event as described for the Preferred Project, and impacts would be *less than significant*. As with the Preferred Project, the No SW-Sealed alternative would also result in a benefit regarding the increased resilience of Aquatic Park to withstand flooding from multiple storm events.

Flooding due to Mechanical Failure of the Slide Gates. The No Additional SW alternative would result in the same less-than-significant impact as described for the Preferred Project, assuming operation of an OMM plan.

A2-HYD-6 The No Additional SW alternative would have the potential to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. (SU)

The No Additional SW alternative would limit the inflow of stormwater to the Aquatic Park lagoons, although to a lesser degree than under the Preferred Project and No SW-Sealed alternative. Under existing conditions, when runoff from moderate-sized events is unable to discharge to the Bay, water backs up into the Strawberry and Potter Street storm drain lines, eventually spilling from drain inlets or manholes into the streets of West Berkeley.

Under the No Additional SW alternative, the slide gates would be opened to allow runoff from large events to enter the lagoons. Within the Strawberry and Potter storm drain lines, estimated overflow volumes during the 2-year flood event were the same as under existing conditions. For the 100-year flood event, the estimated total overflow volume from the system also remained unchanged relative to existing conditions. When these flows are partitioned, however, model results indicate that the overflow volume from the Potter line would be slightly less than under existing conditions, while the overflow volume from the Strawberry line would increase slightly – by 1 acre-foot or less. While the volume of storm drain overflows into the streets of West Berkeley would be less (Table 5-1 and Table 5-2) under the No Additional SW alternative, as compared to the Preferred Project or the No SW-Sealed alternative, flooding from storm drain overflows would still occur, which would be a potentially significant impact.

Implementation of the Potter watershed component of the WMP¹ would mitigate this impact. However, given the uncertainty of implementation of necessary mitigation due to the prohibitive cost (as described in Impact HYD-6), this potential increase in flooding would be *significant and unavoidable*. It should be noted, however, the magnitude of the predicted increase in overflow volume for the Strawberry line during the 2-year storm is relatively small. If the No Additional SW alternative is approved, minor modifications to this alternative that would likely eliminate this increase could be pursued during final design. Examples that were not considered during the CEQA assessment include slight changes in pipe size or slide gate configuration, or using different assumptions regarding slide gate timing and functioning.

A2-HYD-7 The No Additional SW alternative would not otherwise degrade water quality. (NI)

There are no additional potential impacts related to water quality beyond those discussed and addressed above under Impacts A2-HYD-1 and A2-HYD-4, above. Therefore,

¹ Capital improvement recommendations for Potter watershed include an innovative combination of conventional measures (such as pipe enlargement) and “green” right-of-way retrofits to treat, slow, and potentially re-use stormwater. Such “green infrastructure” measures could include right-of-way landscaping, underground temporary storage piping, permeable surfacing, and trash capture devices. (City of Berkeley, Watershed Management Plan, October 2011)

implementation of the No Additional SW alternative would not otherwise degrade water quality, resulting in **no impact**, identical to the Preferred Project.

A2-HYD-8 The No Additional SW alternative would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. (NI)

No additional housing or other habitable structures would be placed within a FEMA defined 100-year flood hazard area as part of the No Additional SW alternative, resulting in **no impact**, identical to the Preferred Project.

A2-HYD-9 The No Additional SW alternative would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. (LTS)

The No Additional SW alternative would result in the same **less-than-significant** impact as the Preferred Project because it would involve the same improvements.

A2-HYD-10 The No Additional SW alternative would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. (NI)

Identical to the Preferred Project, the No Additional SW alternative would have **no impact** with regard to exposure of people or structures to significant risk from failure of a dam or levee.

A2-HYD-11 The No Additional SW alternative could expose people or structures to substantial risk of inundation by sea level rise. (PS)

Modeling results indicate that the No Additional SW alternative would increase maximum water surface elevations resulting from the 2-year storm event relative to existing conditions within the Main Lagoon, but not to the level of the lowest-lying adjacent structure, and predicted water surface elevations from the 100-year storm would decrease. Sea level rise would further increase high-water levels experienced during storm periods, resulting in a potentially significant impact, as would occur with the Preferred Project. The No Additional SW alternative would adhere to the same mitigation measure as identified for the Preferred Project (Mitigation Measure HYD-5.1), thereby reducing potential impacts to a **less-than-significant** level.

A2-HYD-12 The No Additional SW alternative would not expose people or structures to substantial risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (LTS)

Inundation from Seiche. Identical to the Preferred Project, the No Additional SW alternative would have a **less-than-significant** impact on the response to a seiche within the lagoon system.

Inundation from Tsunami. The net impact of the No Additional SW alternative on tsunami-caused flooding would be *less-than-significant*, identical to the Preferred Project.

Inundation from Mudflows. Identical to the Preferred Project, the No Additional SW alternative would have *no impact* related to inundation from mudflows.

Biological Resources

Implementation of the No Additional SW alternative would have similar effects on biological resources as those described for the Preferred Project. As described in Section 4.2, Biological Resources, database queries and site visits did not identify any special status or listed plant or animal species. Therefore, the No Additional SW alternative would not have a substantial adverse impact on such species. The No Additional SW alternative would include the same storm drain infrastructure modifications, tide tube improvements, and habitat restoration efforts as evaluated for the Preferred Project. Therefore, the No Additional SW alternative would result in the same construction-related impacts to riparian habitat, aquatic habitat, wetlands, and other sensitive natural areas at the project site, similar to the Preferred Project, and mitigation measures identified for the Preferred Project to reduce potentially significant impacts would also be required (Mitigation Measures BR-3.1, BR-6.1, BR-6.2, and BR-7.1).

The primary difference between the No Additional SW alternative and the Preferred Project is related to stormwater management. Unlike the Preferred Project, which would limit all storm drain outflows to the lagoons, the No Additional SW alternative would continue the current management practices and would allow stormwater to enter during larger storm events (2-year event and greater). On balance (by design), the same amount of runoff would enter the lagoons after implementation of the No Additional SW alternative as enters them now. However, in the No Additional SW alternative, the timing of runoff entry would change such that pollutants would be at maximum dilution, which would reduce the impact on water quality in the lagoon as compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the No Additional SW alternative could result in a benefit to water quality, that, in turn, would lead to improved aquatic habitat, similar to the Preferred Project.

The No Additional SW alternative would adhere to the City Municipal Code provisions governing the protection of the project site as important wildlife habitat and the removal of trees and shrubs. The No Additional SW alternative would also comply with the City's Live Oak Protection Ordinance, similar to the Preferred Project. Therefore, the No Additional SW alternative would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, resulting in a *less-than-significant* impact, similar to the Preferred Project.

Alternative 3: No Project

Hydrology and Water Quality

The No Project alternative would not modify the existing Potter Street and Strawberry storm drain connections to the project site, nor would the tide tubes connecting the project site lagoons to the Bay be restored. As such, the volume of stormwater entering the lagoons from the Potter Street and

Strawberry storm drains would remain unchanged, and there would be no impact related to storm drain overflow and flooding upgradient of the project site, which would occur with the Preferred Project. Further, the tidal exchange between the Bay and the lagoons would not change and there would be no impact related to erosion and/or flooding associated with an increased tidal range in the lagoons. Additionally, because construction would not occur under the No Project alternative, there would be no impact related to short-term erosion or sedimentation associated with ground-disturbing activities. High water temperatures and low dissolved oxygen levels in the lagoons would not be improved under the No Project Alternative since this alternative would not restore the tide tubes or improve connection between the lagoons. Thus, the beneficial impacts identified under the Preferred Project would not occur with the No Project Alternative.

The No Project Alternative would not result in placement of housing or structures in the 100-year floodplain and would not expose additional people to hazards associated with potential sea-level rise. Similar to the Preferred Project, the No Project Alternative would not increase the amount of impervious surface area at the project site and would not rely on groundwater as a water source. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on groundwater supplies and recharge. The No Project Alternative would not expose people or structures to hazards associated with tsunami, seiche, or dam failure, resulting in no impact similar to the Preferred Project.

Biological Resources

The No Project alternative would not involve construction of any kind. The project site would remain unchanged from existing conditions. As such, improvements to aquatic and terrestrial habitat, such as water quality improvement and invasive species removal, would not be implemented. The project site lagoons would continue to have water temperatures and dissolved oxygen levels that currently exist and stress aquatic species. Because this alternative would not involve any construction activities, there would be no construction-related impacts on habitat or species. Further, because the No Project Alternative would not involve habitat restoration, this alternative would have not have the beneficial impacts on riparian habitat, wetlands or sensitive natural communities as would occur with the Preferred Project. Similar to the project, under the No Project Alternative, Aquatic Park site would continue to function as wildlife habitat and a public recreation area and, therefore, would not conflict with General Plan policies focused on the preservation of such uses at Aquatic Park. However, because the No Project alternative would not involve habitat restoration, this alternative would have not have the beneficial effect on riparian habitat, wetlands or sensitive natural communities as would occur with the Preferred Project.

5.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Sections 21002 and 21081 of CEQA requires lead agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures or feasible environmentally superior alternatives in order to substantially lessen or avoid otherwise significant adverse environmental effects, unless specific social or other conditions make such mitigation measures or alternatives infeasible. CEQA also requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives analyzed. In general, the environmentally superior

alternative is the project that avoids or substantially lessens some or all of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Preferred Project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6).

Table 5-3 summarizes the comparative environmental impacts of the project alternatives, based on the analyses provided in Section 5.4, Impact Assessment, above.

**Table 5-3
Comparison of Impacts Among Project Alternatives**

Environmental Issue	No SW- Unsealed (Preferred Project)	No SW- Sealed (Alternative 1)	No Additional SW (Alternative 2)	No Project Alternative (Alternative 3)
Hydrology and Water Quality				
Water Quality (Construction)	LTS/MM	=	=	-
Water Quality (Operation)	LTS	=	-	+
Groundwater Supplies and Recharge	NI	=	=	-
Shoreline Erosion	LTS/MM	-	-	-
Sediment Deposition/Dredging	LTS/MM	=	=	-
Siltation/Turbidity	LTS	=	=	-
Soil Erosion/Stormwater	LTS/MM	+	-	-
On-or Off-Site Flooding	LTS/MM	=	=	-
Storm Drain Capacity/Flooding	SU/MM	+	-	-
Housing in 100-Year Floodplain	NI	=	=	=
Structures/Fill in 100-Year Floodplain	LTS	=	=	-
Dam Inundation	NI	=	=	=
Sea Level Rise	LTS/MM	+	=	-
Seiche and Tsunami	LTS	=	=	=
Mudflow	NI	=	=	=
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Species/Habitat (Construction)	LTS/MM	=	=	-
Special-Status Species/Habitat (Operation)	LTS	=	=	-
Wetland/Aquatic Habitat (Construction)	LTS/MM	=	=	-
Wetland/Aquatic Habitat (Operation)	LTS	=	=	+
Wildlife Corridors or Nursery Sites	LTS	=	=	-
Nesting Birds	LTS/MM	=	=	-
Monarch Butterflies	LTS/MM	=	=	-
Conflicts with Local Policies or Ordinances	LTS	=	=	-

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less-than-Significant

LTS/MM = Less-than-Significant with Mitigation

SU = Significant Unavoidable even with mitigation

Source: Atkins, 2012.

= impacts would be identical to the project

+ impacts would be more severe than the project

- impacts would be less than the project

On the basis of comparing the extent to which the alternatives would reduce or avoid the significant impacts of the Preferred Project, the No Project alternative would be environmentally superior because

it would avoid the potentially significant construction-related impacts that could affect habitat or species, and it would avoid significant water quality and flooding impacts, when compared to the Preferred Project. However, the No Project Alternative would not achieve the primary objectives of improving tidal exchange, water circulation, and water quality in the Aquatic Park lagoon system.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, if a No Project alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, an environmentally superior alternative must then be selected from the remaining alternatives. Based on a review of the remaining project alternatives, the No Additional SW alternative (Alternative 2) would be the environmentally superior alternative.

The No Additional SW alternative would involve the same hydrologic and habitat improvement components as the Preferred Project and the No SW-Sealed alternative. However, the No Additional SW alternative would implement a different stormwater management regime than the Preferred Project or the No SW-Sealed alternative. Under the No Additional SW alternative, a portion of peak stormwater flows from larger storm events (2-year storm event and greater) would be directed into the Aquatic Park lagoons, thereby decreasing the capacity load on storm drains upgradient of the project site. As such, the No Additional SW alternative would result in less storm drain overflow and reduced flooding in West Berkeley neighborhoods compared to the Preferred Project (4 acre-feet less spillage for the 2-year event [see Table 5-1] and 6 acre-feet for the 100-year event [see Table 5-2] and substantially less than the No SW-Sealed alternative (29 acre-feet less spillage for the 2-year event [see Table 5-1] and 117 acre-feet less spillage for the 100-year event [see Table 5-2]). This reduction in storm drain overflow would also result in smaller volumes of overland stormwater runoff and lower, pollutant loads, entering the lagoon system. Therefore, the No Additional SW alternative would result in better water quality and aquatic habitat in the Aquatic Park lagoons compared to the Preferred Project, No SW-Sealed alternative, and No Project alternative. While there would be a reduction in storm drain overflows, it still would not be enough to reduce the significant and unavoidable storm drain overflow impact.

Further, the No Additional SW alternative, as well as the Preferred Project and No SW-Sealed alternative, would result in beneficial impacts associated with restoration of salt/brackish wetlands, invasive species removal, revegetation of the shoreline and upland areas, and potential restoration of Bird Island that would not occur with the Preferred Alternative.

5.6 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FROM ANALYSIS IN THE EIR

In addition to the 13 other scenarios evaluated in the APIP (refer to Section 1, Summary, for a description of the process that resulted in the Preferred Project evaluated in this Draft EIR), the City also considered an additional alternative that was focused on the idea of increasing circulation in the Main Lagoon by allowing for more stormwater than currently enters Aquatic Park. This would achieve some of the project objectives including minimizing upstream flooding as well as improving circulation. However, City staff ultimately determined that this alternative could worsen water quality in the Main Lagoon substantially enough that the concept was rejected by the City for analysis in the EIR.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.