



# City of Del Mar Staff Report



TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members

FROM: Kathleen A. Garcia, Planning and Community Development Director  
Via Scott W. Huth, City Manager

DATE: September 21, 2015

SUBJECT: Informational Update on the City Hall/Town Hall/Civic Plaza Project Draft Environmental Impact Report

## REQUESTED ACTION/RECOMMENDATION:

This is an informational item only; no action is requested at this time. The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is in its 45-day public review period, with written comments due to the City no later than 5:00 PM October 26, 2015.

## DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS:

RECON Environmental Inc., environmental analysts for the City Hall/Town Hall project, has prepared the Draft EIR on the project, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Draft EIR analyzed the proposed City Hall, Town Hall, Civic Plaza, parking, as well as the temporary relocation to the Shores property during construction.

The Draft EIR is available for public review and can be downloaded online at [www.delmar.ca.us/cityhall](http://www.delmar.ca.us/cityhall). Additionally, hard copies are available at City Hall and the Del Mar Library to review. At this point in the process, RECON has published their draft analysis of potential impacts and identified potential mitigations. Technical studies (found in the Appendices) have been prepared for visual impact, historic building survey, traffic impact, greenhouse gas, noise, geotechnical and hazardous materials.

The Draft EIR's Executive Summary can be found in Attachment A. This summary does not contain the extensive background and analysis found in the full Draft EIR and its Appendices. Readers should review the entire document to fully understand the project and its environmental consequences.

---

City Council Action:

The Draft EIR analyzed the following components and found them to not have significant impacts:

- air quality
- greenhouse gas emissions
- land use
- traffic
- agriculture and forestry resources
- biological resources
- hazards and hazardous materials
- mineral resources
- geology and soils
- hydrology and water quality
- population and housing
- public services
- recreation
- utilities and service systems

The Draft EIR found that the proposed project could have a significant impact and require mitigation in the following areas:

- Cultural Resources: Project Site and Temporary Relocation (Driveway Construction)
- Noise: Construction and Operation at both Project Site and Temporary Relocation Site
- Aesthetics: Project Site Landscaping, Building Features (e.g., Trellis and Plaza Perimeter Wall), Light and Glare

The Draft EIR also found that the proposed project would create a significant and unmitigable impact in the following area:

- Aesthetics: Project Site with Construction of Expansion Area A

The Draft EIR outlines project alternatives that would reduce significant impacts from the City Hall/Town Hall development:

- No Project Alternative: Required by CEQA; No redevelopment or new development onsite
- Reduced Project Alternative: Removal of parking spaces along western perimeter in surface lot; no Expansion Area A

It also includes project alternatives that would reduce significant impacts from the temporary relocation of City Hall and Town Hall activities:

- Public Hearings at Powerhouse Park Community Building or Other Meeting Rooms
- Public Hearings at the Winston School Auditorium
- Temporary Facilities Placed on the Upper Shores Park Property
- Commercial Properties for Administrative Offices

The Draft EIR is currently undergoing its 45-day public review period. Following this public review period, the City Council will have an opportunity to discuss the EIR analyses, mitigation measures and actions. The purpose of this item is solely for public disclosure and to allow additional opportunities for clarifying questions from the community and the City Council.

### **Schedule**

The Draft EIR became available for its 45-day public review period starting on September 11, 2015 and will conclude at 5:00 PM on October 26, 2015. Comments

must be submitted in writing via email (CityHallCEQA@delmar.ca.us), U.S. mail, or hand delivered to City Hall, 1050 Camino del Mar. Following that period of public review, RECON will prepare the Response to Comments, which will be available for public review on November 25, 2105. The City Council is scheduled to take action on certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report on December 7, 2015.

A community workshop will take place on Monday, September 28 at 6:00 PM in the Del Mar Communications Center (240 10th Street) that will discuss the project's design evolution and DEIR comments. All are encouraged to participate.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The City Hall project efforts to date, including design and EIR, are funded in the adopted FY 2015 - 2016 and 2016 – 2017 Operating and Capital Budget.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

The City Hall project is undergoing an EIR currently, pursuant to the regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

PRIOR CITY COUNCIL REVIEW:

On April 6, 2015, the City Council initiated the Design phase of work and authorized RECON Environmental, Inc. to prepare the EIR for the City Hall project.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – City Hall/Town Hall Project Draft EIR Executive Summary

*Please note that the full Draft EIR is available online at [www.delmar.ca.us/cityhall](http://www.delmar.ca.us/cityhall) or available at City Hall and the Del Mar Library.*



## Executive Summary

### **Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Del Mar City Hall/Town Hall Project Del Mar, California SCH #2015051067**

*Prepared for*

City of Del Mar  
1050 Camino del Mar  
Del Mar, CA 92014  
P 858.755.9313

Contact: Kathleen A. Garcia, FASLA, LEED AP  
Planning and Community Development Director

*Prepared by*

RECON Environmental, Inc.  
1927 Fifth Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92101  
P 619.308.9333

RECON Number 7786  
September 11, 2015

The Draft EIR's Executive Summary does not contain the extensive background and analysis found in the full Draft EIR and its Appendices. Readers should review the entire document to fully understand the project and its environmental consequences.

The Draft EIR is available for public review and can be downloaded online at [www.delmar.ca.us/cityhall](http://www.delmar.ca.us/cityhall). Additionally, hard copies are available at City Hall and the Del Mar Library to review.

## **S.0 Executive Summary**

### **S.1 Synopsis**

This summary provides a brief synopsis of: (1) the Del Mar City Hall/Town Hall project; (2) the results of the environmental analysis contained within this Environmental Impact Report (EIR), (3) the alternatives that were considered, and (4) the major areas of controversy and issues to be resolved by decision-makers. This summary does not contain the extensive background and analysis found in the document. Therefore, the reader should review the entire document to fully understand the project and its environmental consequences.

#### **S.1.1 Location and Setting**

The proposed project would be located on the site of the existing City administration center (City Hall), occupying the approximately 1.5-acre eastern half of the city block bounded by residential properties and Stratford Court to the west, 10<sup>th</sup> Street to the south, 11<sup>th</sup> Street to the north, and fronting Camino del Mar to the east. Existing development on the proposed City Hall/Town Hall site consists of structures and surface parking lots. Surrounding land use is a combination of mixed use—commercial along the Camino del Mar corridor, and residential developments immediately beyond that corridor, and adjacent to the project site to the west, southwest, and northwest. Two vacant commercial lots and a small boutique hotel are located immediately south of the project site, and an office building is located immediately north.

Temporary relocation of the existing City administrative operations would be located at the parking area of the Shores Park located east of Stratford Court and south of 9<sup>th</sup> Street. Portable structures would be placed on the lower pad that is paved for overflow parking for both the Shores Park and the private Winston School, which is located immediately north of the parking area. There are residential properties located to the west across Stratford Court and immediately to the south of the relocation site.

#### **S.1.2 Project Overview**

A detailed description of the proposed project, including a description of the history and background of the planning efforts associated with the development of a new City Hall, is contained in Chapter 3.0, Project Description. An overview of the project is provided below.

The proposed project includes the construction of new City administration facilities (City Hall) to accommodate the existing civic functions within an approximately 9,250-square-foot City Hall facility, an approximate 3,200-square-foot Town Hall meeting room that can accommodate up to 150 persons, with an expansion ability to accommodate up to 250 persons using a breezeway, an approximately 15,000-square-foot outdoor public plaza, and parking for up to 160 vehicles.

Uses proposed within the initial phase of the City Hall development would be the same as currently exist, including offices, public counters, meeting rooms, and restrooms. No increase in staffing is proposed, nor are other departments proposed to be relocated to the site as part of this project. The Town Hall would accommodate the City Council chambers, community meeting space, and the Del Mar television studio network offices. An increase in meeting space would allow for events up to 250 people and more frequent use of the civic facilities by the community for public meetings and workshops.

An outdoor plaza is designed to be an open area with flexible space to support uses including but not limited to, performances, art exhibits, community gatherings, and farmers' market space, as well as seating areas. Uses in this area may utilize outdoor amplified sound systems and lighting, oriented and focused toward the event and attendees. Parking would be located in a surface parking lot along the western property boundary accessed from 11<sup>th</sup> Street; and within a two-story parking garage proposed beneath the City Hall building and a portion of the outdoor plaza. Access for the parking garage would be from both 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> streets.

A future expansion area for an additional 20,000 square feet of public facility uses consistent with the Public Facilities designation of the City's Zoning Ordinance is included as part of the project. Specific uses and timeline for this future expansion area are not defined at this time but may include expansion of the Town Hall, City Hall, plaza, or additional uses as allowed in the Public Facilities zone. Development of the future expansion area would be reviewed for compliance with the existing land use and zoning, design review, and consistency with this EIR.

Existing City administrative operations would be relocated to a temporary relocation site at the Shores Park parking area. Temporary portable structures would be occupied at this location for approximately 30 months, at which time all temporary uses would be removed.

### **S.1.3 Project Objectives**

The following primary project objectives have been developed to frame and support the purpose of the project, assist the Lead Agency in developing a reasonable range of alternatives to be evaluated in this EIR, and ultimately aid decision-makers in consideration of the potential environmental effects:

- Create an activated civic facility with adequate space for existing administrative functions, with public meeting spaces and facilities.
- Provide a flexible hearing and meeting space that could allow for indoor and outdoor uses to come together.
- Develop public outdoor areas within the project site for various passive and active uses.
- Maintain multi-modal access to the site, including parking for cars and facilities for bicycles, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant access and connections for pedestrians.
- Create sufficient parking for City staff and public use during the day, and for planned events outside of normal business hours.

- Maintain significant views for neighboring residential properties and view corridors associated with public spaces.
- Provide for future expansion areas within the project site consistent with the existing land use and zoning regulations.

### **S.1.4 Discretionary Actions**

The proposed project requires the following discretionary actions on the part of the City Council:

1. Design Review Permits for the City Hall/Town Hall site and the temporary relocation site at the Shores Park.
2. Coastal Development Permits for both the City Hall/Town Hall site and the temporary relocation site at the Shores Park as detailed in Chapter 30.75 et al. of the Del Mar Municipal Code.
3. Land Conservation Permit (Del Mar Municipal Code Chapter 23.33) for proposed grading outside the footprint of a structure that exceeds 25 cubic yards of cut or fill, and alteration in the existing or natural grade elevation in excess of 18 inches.
4. Tree Removal Permit for the removal of trees on public lands.
5. Alley (Street) Vacation for an unimproved, 20-foot-wide, east-west alley between the two parcels comprising the City Hall site.
6. Boundary (Lot Line) Adjustment for relocation of the existing boundary between the two project parcels to accommodate required parking.

All of these actions are covered by this EIR.

## **S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects**

Table S-1, located at the end of this section, summarizes the results of the environmental analysis completed for the proposed project. As summarized in Table S-1 and discussed in Chapter 4.0, the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts associated with the issues of aesthetics, cultural resources and noise. The issue areas of air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, land use, and traffic would result in less than significant impacts (See Chapter 4.0, Environmental Analysis), as well as the impacts associated with agriculture and forestry resources, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems (See Chapter 6.0, Effects Found Not to

be Significant. Cumulative impacts which are included in issue analysis, would be less than significant for all issues.

### **S.3 Areas of Controversy**

As identified in the Notice of Preparation and scoping process, areas of controversy related to environmental issues center on:

- Potential unreasonable blockage of views from public right-of-way and private residential views.
- Project traffic concentrated at the proposed driveways on 11<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Noise from increased activity of the project site.
- Air quality and odor emissions from the proposed parking garage.
- The noise, traffic, and land uses at the Shores Park temporary relocation site.

### **S.4 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body**

The City Council will need to determine whether the impacts of the proposed project have been adequately disclosed and mitigation measures would be feasible for reducing or avoiding impacts. Further, a determination of whether the alternatives proposed would be preferable as means of lessening or avoiding impacts identified for the proposed project while meeting the project objectives.

### **S.5 Project Alternatives**

CEQA Guidelines mandate that the EIR analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects. These alternatives allow informed decision making and public participation. The alternatives fully evaluated in Chapter 7 include the No Project (No Development/Existing Condition) Alternative and a Reduced Project Alternative. Also analyzed within this section are alternatives for the proposed temporary relocation. They include Public Hearings at Powerhouse Park Community Building or Other Meeting Rooms; Public Hearings at the Winston School Auditorium; Temporary Facilities Placed on the Upper Shores Park Property; and Commercial Properties for Administrative Offices. This approach would allow for flexibility, where all facilities would not be required to be at a single site, and could be separated into multiple locations based on facilities sizing and availability.

## **S.5.1 No Project (No Development/Existing Condition) Alternative**

The No Project (No Development/Existing Condition) Alternative is addressed to compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the project is approved.

### **S.5.1.1 Description of the No Project (No Development/Existing Condition) Alternative**

The No Project (No Development/Existing Condition) Alternative is required by CEQA to be included to illustrate the environmental effects of the existing on-site uses and structures compared to the environmental effects of the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would involve the continued use of the City Hall site without any substantial improvements or modifications to the site or buildings. City administrative services would continue to be housed in the buildings on-site, including the portable buildings on the upper and lower pads. The abandoned building, immediately south of City Hall, would remain and continue to be unusable due to previous determinations on the building structural safety. City Council, committee and public meetings would continue to be held in the hearing building, along with television studio operations. Under the No Project Alternative there would be no need for temporary relocation to another site. As a result, the proposed improvements to the driveway access and Shores Park fencing along the southern and western property boundaries would not occur.

### **S.5.1.2 Conclusion**

Because no development would occur, no “impacts,” as defined pursuant to CEQA would occur. However, the No Project Alternative would result in the continued use of aged buildings and the existing abandoned building would not be removed. In November 2005, and subsequently in September 2013, Ninyo & Moore conducted an asbestos and lead-based paint survey, and limited hazardous building materials survey update, respectively, for the on-site City buildings. Based on the 2005 survey, asbestos containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP) were present in both of the original buildings (City Hall and storage building). While the presence of ACMs and LBPs in a building does not necessarily mean that the health of the occupants is endangered, when ACMs and LBP deteriorates, is in damaged condition, or is disturbed, such as during renovation operations, dust may be released, creating a potential health hazard for building occupants, maintenance personnel, and contractors. During the 2013 survey only the storage building was analyzed for updated information, and following this review, the storage building was deemed to be unsafe and access is no longer permitted. With the No Project Alternative, proper removal and containment of these structures would not be accomplished. See Appendix I for copies of the reports.

No permits or other discretionary actions would be required for this alternative, and the continued operation of the site would not result in any conflicts with existing Public Facilities (PF) land use designation and zoning. The existing visual landscape and both public right-of-way and private views through the site would not be altered with the No Project Alternative.

No changes to the existing circulation within the area, specifically driveways and parking on-site, would occur under the No Project Alternative.

The existing condition has view blockages related to the City Hall buildings on the upper pad and landscaping on-site. The No Project Alternative would not change these obstructed views. The significant and unmitigable impacts to scenic views associated with the proposed project development would be avoided with this alternative, as the impacted views already exist. This alternative would not result in the new on-site public viewing areas proposed in the Civic Plaza and on the south side of City Hall.

Air and greenhouse gas emissions associated with construction of the proposed project would be avoided; however, the energy efficiencies that would be gained from the development of new City facilities would not be realized with the No Project Alternative. Noise associated with construction would be avoided with this alternative; however, the existing operational noise (e.g., HVAC, traffic and parking) would remain at the same level as currently exists. The grading and excavation associated with the proposed project would be unnecessary, and therefore, the potential impacts to cultural resources, specifically subsurface historic, prehistoric, and paleontological, would be avoided with the No Project Alternative.

As stated above, with the No Project Alternative, relocation of City administrative operations to another site would not be necessary. Therefore, all potential impacts, including those that would be less than significant, would not occur to the temporary relocation site at the Shores Park.

## **S.5.2 Reduced Project Alternative**

### **S.5.2.1 Description of the Reduced Project Alternative**

The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the potential for development of the future expansion areas to expansion area B, located immediately south of City Hall, and expansion area C, located in the southwestern corner of the project site, approximately 4,500 square feet. This alternative would omit expansion area A in the northeastern portion of the site in the plaza. Under this alternative, the total expansion area would be approximately 7,200 square feet. See Figure 7-1 for the conceptual site plan for the Reduced Project Alternative.

Additionally, the parking located in the surface parking lot, facing westward (approximately 28 spaces) would be removed from the proposed project. The remaining parking would be approximately 132 spaces between the parking garage and the eastern facing parking row within the surface parking lot. These parking spaces would be overflow parking for public and commercial use, as well as for public events, and would not be required to meet the Del Mar Municipal Code for parking on-site.

The temporary relocation to the Shores Park would still be required for the Reduced Project Alternative.

The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the potential for development of the future expansion areas to expansion area B, located immediately south of City Hall, and expansion area C, located in the southwestern corner of the project site, approximately 4,500 square feet. This alternative would omit expansion area A in the northeastern portion of the site in the plaza. Under this alternative, the total expansion area would be approximately 7,200 square feet. See Figure 7-1 for the conceptual site plan for the Reduced Project Alternative.

Additionally, the parking located in the surface parking lot, facing westward (approximately 28 spaces) would be removed from the proposed project. The remaining parking would be approximately 132 spaces between the parking garage and the eastern facing parking row within the surface parking lot. These parking spaces would be overflow parking for public and commercial use, as well as for public events, and would not be required to meet the Del Mar Municipal Code for parking on-site.

The temporary relocation to the Shores Park would still be required for the Reduced Project Alternative.

### **S.5.2.2 Conclusion**

This alternative would be consistent with the existing land uses and zoning for the site, and would meet the goals and policies for development of the proposed City Hall and Town Hall. The reduced project would not require any additional permits.

The Reduced Project Alternative would decrease the total building square footage that could be developed on the site, thereby potentially reducing the effects on both public right-of-way and private residential views that would be impacted by the development of expansion area A under the proposed project. Specifically expansion area A would be eliminated and would avoid the significant and unmitigable impact related to the unreasonable blockage of scenic views (Impact AES-3). Impacts to private views and from light and glare, identified for the proposed project would be slightly reduced with this alternative (Impacts AES-1, AES-2 and AES-4). The recommended mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the Reduced Project Alternative (MM-AES-1, MMAES-2, and MM-AES-3).

As with the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would still require the same grading and excavation for site development and could directly or indirectly impact cultural resources, including subsurface historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources (Impacts CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3). Implementation of the mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project (MM-CUL-1 and MM-CUL-2) shall be incorporated with this alternative if it is adopted.

The Reduced Project Alternative would have the same construction noise impacts as identified for the proposed project. Grading and construction activities would be the same; therefore, noise impacts at the western property boundary (Impact NOS-1) would result from this alternative. Since this alternative would not include the parking in the lower surface lot, facing westward along the western property boundary, impacts would be reduced but would still be significant (Impact NOS-3). Implementation of the mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project (MM-NOS-1 and MM-NOS-3) shall be incorporated into this alternative if it is adopted.

Air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, while they do not exceed the thresholds for significance and are not considered significant, would be lessened due to the reduction of building area, and in turn energy and materials. It is anticipated that the traffic associated with the Reduced Project Alternative would be generally the same as that of the proposed project, since the proposed project, including the expansion areas, would not generate traffic but accommodate the public accessing City facilities and commercial businesses in proximity to the project site.

This alternative would result in the same significance determination for issue areas addressed in Chapter 6.0, Effects Found Not to be Significant, which include agriculture and forestry resources, biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems.

Relocation of City administrative operations to another site would still be necessary. Assuming the temporary relocation would be at the lower parking area of the Shores Park, all potential impacts at this site would occur as part of the Reduced Project Alternative. Those impacts would be associated with construction of the proposed driveway improvements on subsurface resources (Impacts CUL-1 and CUL-2) and construction and operational noise (Impacts NOS-2 and NOS-4) on adjacent sensitive receptors. Therefore, implementation of the mitigation measures MM-CUL-1, MM-NOS-2, and MM-NOS-3, recommended to reduce these impacts for the proposed project shall be incorporated into this alternative if it is adopted.

## **S.5.3 Temporary Relocation Alternatives**

### **S.5.3.1 Description of the Temporary Relocation Alternatives**

To allow for consideration of temporary relocation options, the City has considered alternatives to allow for placement of City operations, including public hearings and workshops, and television studio operations, at various locations. The alternatives proposed for the temporary relocation are discussed below.

#### **Public Hearings at Powerhouse Park Community Building or Other Existing Meeting Rooms**

This temporary relocation alternative would locate the City administrative offices and the television studio operations on the Shores Park property, while all public hearings (e.g., City Council, Planning Commission, and Design Review Board) and workshops would be located at the Powerhouse Park Community Building or other existing meeting rooms, such as schools or auditoriums. Driveway improvements at Stratford Court would still be required at the Shores Park site. No improvements to community meeting facilities would be necessary to accommodate public hearings at these sites as they are designed for large public gatherings.

#### **Public Hearings at the Winston School Auditorium**

Under this alternative, the proposed City administrative offices and television studio operations would still be located on the lower pad, south of the Winston School, while all public

hearings (e.g., City Council, Planning Commission, and Design Review Board) and workshops would be located within the Winston School auditorium. The driveway improvements at Stratford Court would be included. No other improvements to Winston School would be necessary.

### **Temporary Facilities Placed on the Upper Shores Park Property**

This temporary relocation alternative would locate the proposed City administrative offices and additional temporary portables for the hearing room and television studio operations on the upper Shores Park site. Temporary restroom facilities would be provided on the Shores Park property for both the administrative office space and public meeting space as part of this alternative. The same driveway improvements at Stratford Court would be necessary with no additional improvements required to access the upper lot. No trees in the upper lot would be removed for this alternative, and limited, shallow trenching for utilities connections would be required.

### **Commercial Properties for Administrative Offices**

This alternative would allow for specific administrative offices to be located at rented or leased commercial properties within the City at a smaller square footage than considered above under Section 7.1.3.3, Alternatives Considered but Rejected. Under this reduced square footage, civic services could be separated into smaller leased facilities for the 30 month relocation period, thereby reducing the level of operation on the Shores Park site. The temporary relocation facilities at the Shores Park could be reduced or eliminated if another alternative scenario is also selected such as alternative use of Powerhouse Park or the Winston School Auditorium for public hearings. The driveway improvements at Stratford Court to allow for both ingress and egress would only be constructed if remaining services were proposed at the Shores Park property.

## **S.5.3.2 Conclusion**

### **Public Hearings at Powerhouse Park Community Building or Other Existing Meeting Rooms**

This alternative would result in the same impacts as the Shores Park site with respect to grading impacts to cultural resources (CUL-1 and CUL-2) and construction noise (NOS-2). However, because the City administrative offices would close at 5:30 p.m., noise level limits associated with nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) would not occur. Therefore, the recommended mitigation measures CUL-1 and NOS-2 would still be required for this relocation alternative.

With respect to the public hearings at Powerhouse Park Community Building or other existing facilities, traffic conditions near Powerhouse Park and other community meeting facilities include regular use of these meeting rooms for special events and were considered at the time the Powerhouse Park Community Building and other public meeting spaces were approved and constructed. The traffic activity generated by a public hearing would be no greater than a similar public event and would not create any unforeseen traffic or parking conditions near the

community center. It should be noted, that parking for this site, would be limited to the paid public parking; however, this is not an issue that must be considered under CEQA.

Noise levels and air quality and greenhouse gas emissions would not exceed those already contemplated for the facilities upon approval of permits and entitlements.

### **Public Hearings at the Winston School Auditorium**

Under this alternative the proposed City administrative offices would still be located on the lower pad, south of the Winston School, while all public hearings (e.g., City Council, Planning Commission, and Design Review Board) and workshops would be located within the Winston School Auditorium. The driveway improvements at Stratford Court to allow for both ingress and egress would be included, and would still result in impacts to cultural resources (CUL-1 and CUL-2) and construction noise (NOS-2). No other improvements to Winston School would be necessary.

Noise levels associated with persons attending and congregating outside meetings and hearings would be attenuated by the Winston School auditorium. However, the noise associated with people dispersing following a meeting after 10:00 p.m. would still occur with this relocation alternative (NOS-4). Therefore, the recommended mitigation measures CUL-1, NOS-2, and NOS-3 would still be required for this relocation alternative.

### **Temporary Facilities Placed on the Upper Shores Park Property**

The proposed City administrative offices and additional temporary portables for the hearing room and television studio operations would be located on the upper Shores Park site. Temporary restroom facilities would be provided on the Shores Park property for both the administrative office space and public meeting space as part of this alternative. The driveway improvements at Stratford Court would be necessary to allow for both ingress and egress to the site, and would still result in impacts to cultural resources (Impacts CUL-1 and CUL-2) and construction noise (Impact NOS-2). The driveway to the upper lot would not be improved and no trees in the upper lot would be removed for this alternative. Limited, shallow trenching for utility connections would be required. See Figure 7-2 for approximate site location on the upper lot.

Should this alternative be selected, the analysis provided for the proposed project would adequately reflect the traffic patterns that would occur under this alternative as parking and access would be the same.

Because the City administrative offices would close at 5:30 p.m., noise level limits associated with nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) would not occur. Under this alternative, the noise levels associated with persons attending and congregating outside meetings and hearings will be located further away for the sensitive receptors identified for the proposed project. Impact NOS-4 would be avoided under this alternative.

With respect to the visual effects of this alternative on public right-of-way and private residential views, as illustrated in the attached photos in Figures 7-3a and 7-3b, the upper lot

is well below Camino del Mar. The first-floor roofline of the existing development on the site is representative of the height of the portable structure that would be placed on this site, which would be single-story. Additionally, the vegetation on the site would further screen the addition of this building from the roadway. No “blue water” views would be lost with the placement of the Town Hall buildings on the upper lot. Similar to the proposed temporary relocation site, this alternative would not result in any significant impacts related to aesthetics and visual quality.

### **Commercial Properties for Administrative Offices**

This alternative would allow for specific administrative offices to be located at rented or leased commercial properties within the City at a smaller square footage than required for all components of the project as discussed above under Section 7.2, Alternatives Considered but Rejected. Under this reduced square footage, civic services could be separated into smaller leased facilities for the 30-month relocation period, thereby reducing the level of operation on the Shores Park site. The temporary relocation facilities at the Shores Park could be reduced, or if another alternative scenario is selected, not located on the property (e.g., such as with alternative use of Powerhouse Park or the Winston School Auditorium for public hearings) under this alternative. The driveway improvements at Stratford Court to allow for both ingress and egress would only be constructed if remaining services were proposed at the Shores Park property, and as such impacts to cultural resources (Impacts CUL-1 and CUL-2) and construction noise (Impact NOS-2) would still occur. Should City Hall administrative services be placed in commercial buildings within the City, they would replace similar office-related uses that would generate similar traffic-related trips. Therefore, there would be no unforeseen changes in traffic conditions as a result of this alternative. However, City operations would be impacted by not maintaining the departments together.

### **S.5.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative**

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e)(2) requires that an EIR identify the “environmentally superior” alternative based on the evaluation of the Plan and its alternatives. The No Project (No Development/Existing Condition) Alternative would avoid all impacts and would be the environmentally superior alternative. However, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6 (e)(2), if the No Project Alternative is determined to be the most environmentally superior project, then another alternative among the alternatives evaluated must be identified as the environmentally superior project. The project itself may not be identified as the environmentally superior alternative.

The Reduced Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative as it would avoid a significant and unmitigable impact to scenic views resulting from construction of expansion area A. Additionally, this alternative would reduce the proposed project impacts associated with operational noise at the western property line. While air quality and greenhouse gas emissions would not exceed the thresholds for significance with the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would reduce these impacts. The Reduced Project Alternative would also attain most of the proposed project’s objectives.

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation Measure	Impact Level after Mitigation
<b>AESTHETICS</b>			
<i>Threshold AES-1: Views</i>	<p>Improper selection and placement of landscaping, particularly larger specimen trees could block ocean views from private residential views as well as public views along 10th Street, 11th Street, and Camino del Mar. These impacts would not likely occur in the short term, but would occur as landscaping matures, which would result in a significant impact to blue water views (Impact AES-1).</p> <p>While public views from Camino del Mar would be maximized through the project design, certain project features could unnecessarily block ocean views such as the low wall proposed at the western edge of the civic plaza space and the proposed trellis, if it becomes heavily vegetated with landscaping. As a result, a significant impact to views would occur from public viewing spaces on the project site and along the Camino del Mar frontage as a result of initial development of the project, without construction of expansion areas (Impact AES-2)</p> <p>Expansion areas A would block views of the ocean from the north end of Camino del Mar along the project frontage. While this view blockage would be similar to the existing condition due to existing structures at the north east corner of the site, the initial phase of the project would remove the existing structures and provide a civic plaza with public ocean viewing opportunities. Construction of expansion area A would block the ocean views created by the initial construction of the project. Thus, when compared to the initial phase of the project, expansion area A would result in a significant impact to ocean views (Impacts AES-3).</p>	<p><b>MM-AES-1:</b> To mitigate Impact AES-1, final landscaping plans shall consider the view corridors and either select plant material that are at or less than the building height; or, if taller, strategically placed to minimize view impacts.</p> <p><b>MM-AES-2:</b> To mitigate Impact AES-2, the City shall implement the following mitigation measures on the project site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The safety wall along the western and northern edge of the civic plaza shall be made of a transparent or semi-transparent (50%) material.</li> <li>• Trellis landscaping shall not be permitted in the area north of the City Hall building that is within the view corridor.</li> <li>• No permanent shade structures shall be permitted in northern portion of the civic plaza (north of City Hall).</li> </ul> <p>No feasible mitigation has been identified to mitigate significant impacts associated with Impact AES-3. However, a Reduced Project Alternative is included in Chapter 7, Alternatives, that would omit expansion area A, and avoid the significant and unmitigable impacts identified above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant for Impact AES-1 and AES-2</p> <p>Significant and Unavoidable for Impact AES-3</p>
<i>Threshold AES-4: Light and Glare</i>	<p>Onsite lighting at the project site and the temporary relocation site would comply with applicable lighting regulations, including the glazing and exterior lighting requirements in the City's Zoning Ordinance. Even with compliance with regulations, significant impacts from light and glare could occur at the City Hall site due to indoor lighting, vehicle headlights in the parking structure, and outdoor lighting. Thus, a potentially significant light and glare impact would occur at the City Hall site (Impact AES-4).</p>	<p><b>MM-AES-3:</b> To mitigate Impact AES-4, the City shall implement the following mitigation measures at both the project site and temporary relocation site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Light sensors shall be placed on all interior light fixtures within all structures to ensure lights are shut off when rooms or buildings are not in use.</li> <li>• Louvers or other screening mechanisms along the western side of the parking garage shall be implemented to reduce light spill to residential properties.</li> <li>• Windows materials shall be used that are designed to be absorptive of light or made of anti-reflective materials.</li> <li>• Bollard or low wall lighting shall be used in the surface parking lot, placed below the height of the proposed noise wall (MM-NOS-3 and MM-NOS-4)</li> <li>• Plaza lighting shall include low lighting, facing downward and away from residential areas and located on solid surfaces where feasible.</li> <li>• Parking structure lighting to be placed on the interior of solid walls, facing inward toward the center of the parking structure.</li> <li>• Implementation of the noise wall in MM-NOS-3 and MM-NOS-4 would further mitigate potential light impacts at both the project site and temporary relocation site from vehicle headlights.</li> </ul>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation Measure	Impact Level after Mitigation
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
<i>Threshold CUL-2: Archeological Resources</i>	<p>Due to the location of the project site in an area of prehistoric and historic use, there is potential for subsurface archaeological deposits to exist on the western one-half of the property, where there has been limited prior grading of the site. Thus, construction of the proposed project has the potential to destroy prehistoric/historic archaeological resources through grading, representing a significant impact (Impact CUL-1).</p> <p>With respect to the temporary relocation of the existing administrative operations to portable structures on the Shores Park site, site preparation activities would include the grading for improved two-way driveway access at the southwestern corner of the property. Impacts to archaeological resources from the improvements to the driveway access, temporary relocation has the potential to destroy prehistoric/historic archaeological resources through grading, representing a significant impact (Impact CUL-2).</p>	<p>MM-CUL-1: To mitigate Impacts CUL-1 and CUL-2, a qualified archaeological monitor and a Native American monitor shall be present during project-related ground-disturbing activities for both the proposed City Hall/Town Hall site development and the driveway improvements at the Shores Park temporary relocation site. The monitors would have the authority to stop and/or divert grading, trenching, or excavating if an archaeological resource is encountered. The qualified archaeologist, and Native American monitor if the discovery is prehistoric, shall evaluate the significance of the discovery. If it is significant, a data recovery program would be implemented in order to mitigate impacts to the resource.</p>	Less than Significant
<i>Threshold CUL-3: Paleontological Resources</i>	<p>The project site is primarily underlain by the Bay Point Formation and thus has a high sensitivity for paleontological resources. The proposed project may result in excavation of previously undisturbed deposits of the Bay Point Formation. This disturbance would have the potential to significantly impact subsurface paleontological resources, representing a significant impact (Impact CUL-3).</p>	<p>MM-CUL-2: To mitigate Impact CUL-3, a qualified paleontological monitor shall be onsite during grading that cuts into the Bay Point Formation, a fossil-bearing formation. The monitor would have the authority to stop and/or divert grading, trenching, or excavating if a significant paleontological resource is encountered. An excavation plan would be implemented to mitigate the discovery. Excavation would include the salvage of the fossil remains (simple excavation or plaster-jacketing of larger and/or fragile specimens); recording stratigraphic and geologic data; and transport of fossil remains to laboratory for processing and curation.</p>	Less than Significant
<b>NOISE</b>			
<i>Threshold NOS-1: Exceedance of Noise Standards</i>	<p>Noise from construction would expose sensitive noise receivers adjacent to the western property line to noise levels up to 79 dB(A) <math>L_{eq}</math> with maximum noise levels of up to 82 dB(A) <math>L_{max}</math>. These noise levels would exceed the City 75 dB(A) <math>L_{eq}</math> noise level limit for construction, representing a significant impact (Impact NOS-1).</p> <p>Demolition and construction of the project driveway at the temporary relocation site would generate noise levels at the nearest receiver (717 Stratford Court) of up to 83 dB(A) <math>L_{eq}</math> with maximum noise levels of up to 87 dB(A) <math>L_{max}</math>. These noise levels would exceed the City 75 dB(A) <math>L_{eq}</math> noise level limit for construction and would expose persons to noise levels in excess of applicable standards, representing a significant impact (Impact NOS-2).</p>	<p>MM-NOS-1: To mitigate Impact NOS-1, during all phases of construction that would require equipment to be used outdoors, a noise barrier shall be erected along the entire length of the western property line of the project site. The top of the noise barrier shall be 10 feet above the existing grade. The barrier may be constructed of any a material with a minimum weight of 2 pounds per square foot. Noise barriers must not have any gaps or perforations and may be constructed of, but are not limited to, 5/8-inch plywood, 5/8-inch oriented strand board, or hay bales. Alternatively, a portion of the temporary barrier may be shortened if erected atop the permanent barrier identified in MM-NOS-3, if the minimum height of 10 feet above grade of the construction site is maintained.</p> <p>MM-NOS-2: To mitigate Impact NOS-2, during construction of the proposed driveway improvements at the temporary relocation site, the City shall monitor noise levels during construction, and if noise levels exceed 75 dB(A) <math>L_{eq}</math> at the property line on 717 Stratford Court, a noise barrier shall be erected beginning at the edge roadway and extending east 20 feet along the southern property line. The noise barrier shall be 10 feet above the existing grade and be constructed of a material with a minimum weight of 2 pounds per square foot</p>	Less than Significant

**Table S-1  
Summary of Significant Environmental Analysis Results**

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation Measure	Impact Level after Mitigation
		with no gaps or perforations. Noise barriers may be constructed of, but are not limited to, 5/8-inch plywood, 5/8-inch oriented strand board, or hay bales. Alternatively, a portion of the temporary barrier may be shortened if erected atop the permanent barrier identified in MM-NOS-4, if the minimum height of 10 feet above grade of the construction site is maintained.	
<b>NOISE (continued)</b>			
<p><i>Threshold NOS-1: Exceedance of Noise Standards</i></p>	<p>Noise levels at the southern and western property line would not exceed the allowable daytime limits of 55 dB(A) <math>L_{eq}</math> but would exceed the nighttime property line limit of 45 dB(A) <math>L_{eq}</math> due to activities in the lower surface parking lot. Thus, operation of the project would generate, and expose persons, to noise levels in excess of applicable standards during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., representing a significant impact (Impact NOS-3).</p> <p>Operational noise from the temporary relocation site parking lot would not exceed the daytime noise level limits of 55 dB(A) <math>L_{eq}</math> at any receiver; however, noise levels would exceed the nighttime noise level limit of 45 dB(A) <math>L_{eq}</math> at the properties immediately south of the relocation site and across Stratford Court from the parking area, representing a significant impact (Impact NOS-4).</p>	<p>MM-NOS-3: To mitigate Impact NOS-3, a noise barrier shall be erected along the entire length of the western property line in the lower (western) parking lot of the project site. The top of the noise barrier shall be a minimum of 8 feet above the existing grade of the parking lot and be constructed of a material with a minimum weight of 2 pounds per square foot with no gaps or perforations. Noise barriers may be constructed of, but are not limited to, masonry block, concrete panels, 18-gauge steel sheets, 5/8-inch plywood, 5/8-inch oriented strand board, or hay bales. If wood is used as the primary barrier component, the fence boards must overlap or be of “tongue and groove” construction with a joining compound between the boards to ensure there would be gaps or holes in the fence. Additionally, if wood is used, annual inspection and maintenance must be conducted for the life of the project to ensure the barrier continues to perform to the minimum requirements.</p> <p>MM-NOS-4: To mitigate Impact NOS-4, noise barriers shall be erected along the western property line of the temporary relocation site, west of the proposed surface parking lot, and for a length of 160 feet along the southern property line, beginning at the edge of the sidewalk (southeastern corner) and extending easterly, at the temporary relocation site. The top of the noise barriers shall be a minimum of 6 feet above the existing grade and be constructed of a material with a minimum weight of 2 pounds per square foot with no gaps or perforations. Noise barriers may be constructed of, but are not limited to, masonry block, concrete panels, 18-gauge steel sheets, 5/8-inch plywood, 5/8-inch oriented strand board, or hay bales. If wood is used as the primary barrier component, the fence boards must overlap or be of “tongue and groove” construction with a joining compound between the boards to ensure there would be gaps or holes in the fence. Additionally, if wood is used, annual inspection and maintenance must be conducted for the life of the project to ensure the fencing continues to perform to the minimum requirements. Upon completion of the project, and removal of all structures and temporary uses from the site, the noise barrier may be removed, or if it is to remain, no further maintenance would be required for mitigation purposes as outlined above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>