RESOLUTION NO. RES-17-0051

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH CERTIFYING THAT THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE BELMONT POOL REVITALIZATION PROJECT (STATE CLEARING-HOUSE NO. 2013041063) HAS BEEN COMPLETED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND STATE AND LOCAL GUIDELINES, AND MAKING CERTAIN FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS RELATIVE THERETO; AND ADOPTING SITE PLAN REVIEW, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, STANDARDS VARIANCE, AND LOCAL COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FINDINGS; AND DENYING APPEALS

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 11th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802-4664

WHEREAS, the City of Long Beach has proposed the Belmont Pool Revitalization Project ("Project") which would replace the former Belmont Plaza Olympic Pool (Belmont Pool) facility with a larger and more modern pool complex. The proposed Project is located in the Belmont Shore Beach Park in southeast Long Beach. The Project proposes the construction and operation of an approximately 125,500 square foot (sf) pool complex that includes indoor and outdoor pool components and an approximately 1,500 square foot café. Permanent indoor seating for approximately 1,250 spectators would be provided to view competitive events at the indoor 50-Meter Competition Pool and the Dive Pool. Temporary outdoor seating would be provided for larger events at the outdoor 50-Meter Competition Pool with a maximum seating capacity of up to 3,000 spectators. The proposed Project would allow for recreational and competitive activities to occur simultaneously, if necessary. The proposed project would

consist of three main areas: the pool facility; the open space/park area; and the outdoor café area, including a public restroom facility. The pool facility consists of the recreational and competitive aquatic components and would be the central focus of the Project site. The passive park area would be situated along the western and northern portions of the Project site and near the outdoor café on the east side, and would be intended for general park purposes, similar to the uses at the existing passive park.

Said Project is more fully described in the Belmont Pool Revitalization Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2013041063) (DEIR), a copy of which DEIR, including the complete proposed Project description, is incorporated herein by this reference as though set forth in full, word for word.

WHEREAS, Project implementation will require certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR).

WHEREAS, the City began an evaluation of the proposed project by issuing a Notice of Preparation (NOP) that was circulated from April 18, 2013 to May 17, 2013, and from April 9, 2014 to May 8, 2014. A Notice of Completion was prepared and filed with the State Office of Planning and Research on April 13, 2016. The DEIR was completed on April 13, 2016, and circulated between April 13, 2016 and June 16, 2016.

WHEREAS, three Study Sessions were held on the DEIR. A Planning Commission Study Session was held on May 5, 2016, a Marine Advisory Commission Study Session was held on May 12, 2016, and a City Council Study Session was held on June 14, 2016.

WHEREAS, on March 2, 2017, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the DEIR and FEIR and the Project. At said time, the Planning Commission determined that the DEIR and FEIR were fully compliant with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, certified the DEIR and FEIR as being fully compliant with CEQA and approved all applied for project entitlements, as previously described in this resolution and in the DEIR.

WHEREAS, implementation and construction of the Project constitutes a

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 11th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802-4664

"project" as defined by CEQA, Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., and the City of Long Beach is the Lead Agency for the Project under CEQA;

WHEREAS, it was determined during the initial processing of the Project that it could have potentially significant effects on the environment, requiring the preparation of an EIR;

WHEREAS, the City prepared full and complete responses to the comments received on the DEIR, and distributed the responses in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21092.5;

WHEREAS, the City Council has reviewed and considered the information in and the comments to the DEIR and the responses thereto, and the FEIR at a duly noticed City Council meeting held on May 16, 2017, at which time evidence, both written and oral, was presented to and considered by the City Council;

WHEREAS, the City Council has read and considered all environmental documentation comprising the FEIR, including the DEIR, comments and the responses to comments, and errata (if any) included in the FEIR, and has determined that the DEIR and FEIR consider all potentially significant environmental impacts of the Project and are complete and adequate and fully comply with all requirements of CEQA; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has evaluated and considered all significant impacts, mitigation measures, and project alternatives identified in the DEIR and FEIR.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Long Beach does hereby find, determine and resolve that:

Section 1. All of the above recitals are true and correct and are incorporated herein as though fully set forth.

Section 2. The DEIR and FEIR are adequate and have been completed in compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

Section 3. The FEIR, which reflects the City Council's independent judgment and analysis, is hereby adopted, approved, and certified as complete and adequate under CEQA.

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 11th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802-4664

Section 4. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091, the City Council has reviewed and hereby adopts the CEQA Findings and Facts in Support of Findings for the Belmont Pool Revitalization Project as shown on the attached Exhibit "A", which document is incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full, word for word.

Section 5. The FEIR identifies certain significant environmental effects that would result if the Project is approved. All environmental effects can feasibly be avoided or mitigated and will be avoided or mitigated by the imposition of mitigation measures included with the FEIR. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6, the City Council has reviewed and hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) as shown on Exhibit "B", which document is incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full, word for word, together with any adopted corrections or modifications thereto, and further finds that the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR are feasible, and specifically makes each mitigation measure a condition of project approval.

Section 6. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(e), the record of proceedings relating to this matter has been made available to the public at, among other places, the Department of Development Services, 333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor, Long Beach, California, and is, and has been, available for review during normal business hours.

The information provided in the various staff reports submitted in connection with the Project, the corrections and modifications to the DEIR and FEIR made in response to comments and any errata which were not previously re-circulated, and the evidence presented in written and oral testimony at the public hearing, do not represent significant new information so as to require re-circulation of the DEIR and FEIR pursuant to the Public Resources Code.

Section 7. The City Council hereby formally adopts in full, as though set forth herein, those certain Site Plan Review Findings, Conditional Use Permit Findings,

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 11th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802-4664

Standard Variance Findings, and Local Coastal Development Permit Findings, as set forth in the Staff Report for the subject City Council agenda item and as set forth in the Planning Commission Staff Report of March 2, 2017; and

Section 8. The City Council hereby denies the appeals of Jeff Miller, Melinda Cotton, Gordana Kajer, Anna Christensen, the Long Beach Area Peace Network, Joe Weinstein, and Ann Cantrell, and "CARP;" and hereby approves the land use entitlements including the State Plan Review, Conditional Use Permit, Standards Variance, and Local Coastal Development Permit.

Section 9. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption by the City Council, and the City Clerk shall certify the vote adopting this resolution.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the City Council of the City of Long Beach at its meeting of May 16, 2017, by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers: Price, Supernaw, Mungo, Andrews, Austin, Richardson.

Noes: Councilmembers: Gonzalez, Uranga.

Absent: Councilmembers: Pearce.

City Clerk

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 11th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802-4664

FINDINGS OF FACT IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS FOR THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

BELMONT POOL REVITALIZATION PROJECT

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2013041063

I. BACKGROUND

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires decision-makers to balance the benefits of the Belmont Pool Revitalization Project (proposed Project) against its unavoidable environmental impacts when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, those effects may be considered "acceptable" (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15093[a]). CEQA requires the decision-making agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are infeasible to mitigate. Such reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or elsewhere in the administrative record (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15093 [b]).

A. PROJECT SUMMARY

The Project site is located in the Belmont Shore Beach Park in southeast Long Beach. The approximately 5.8-acre site is bordered on the south by the Pacific Ocean, the beach, bicycle and pedestrian pathways, and volleyball courts; on the west by Belmont Veterans Memorial Pier, Belmont Beach, and the Pier Parking Lot; and on the northwest by Surf Terrace Apartments, Belmont Shores Condominiums, and a Jack in the Box restaurant; on the north by several businesses located along the northern side of East Olympic Plaza; on the northeast by the Belmont Shore neighborhood; on the east by the City of Long Beach (City) beach maintenance yard, the temporary outdoor pool, Rosie's Dog Beach, a boat launch, and the Beach Parking Lot.

The proposed Project would replace the former Belmont Pool facility and provide the City with a revitalized and modern pool complex. The Project proposes the construction and operation of an approximately 125,500 square foot (sf) pool complex that includes indoor and outdoor pool components and an approximately 1,500 sf outdoor café. Permanent indoor seating for approximately 1,250 spectators would be provided to view competitive events at the indoor 50-Meter Competition Pool and the Dive Pool. Temporary outdoor seating would be provided for larger events at the outdoor 50-Meter Competition Pool with a maximum seating capacity of up to 3,000 spectators. The proposed Project does not include any permanent outdoor seating designed for spectator viewing.

The proposed Project would consist of three main areas: the pool facility; the open space/park area; and the outdoor café area, including a public restroom facility. The pool facility consists of the recreational and competitive aquatic components and would be the central focus of the Project site. The passive park area would be situated along the western and northern portions of the Project site and near the outdoor café on the east side, and would be intended for general park uses, similar to the uses at the existing passive park.

A pick-up and drop-off area would be located along the eastern boundary and would be adjacent to the café/restroom area at the southeastern corner of the Project site. East Olympic Plaza would be closed to vehicular traffic.

EXHIBIT A

The purpose of the proposed Project is to replace the former Belmont Pool facility with a state-of-the-art aquatic facility to continue to serve as a recreational and competitive venue for the community, City, region, and State. In addition, the design scope requires that facility be designed to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold certification standards (or the equivalent). The following objectives have been established for the proposed Project and would aid decision-makers in their review of the proposed Project and its associated environmental impacts:

1. Redevelop the City-owned site of the former Belmont Pool with similar aquatic recreational purposes, consistent with the original ballot measure;
2. Replace the former Belmont Pool with a more modern facility that better meets the needs of the local community, region, and State's recreational and competitive swimmers, divers, aquatic sports participants, and additional pool users due to the tremendous demand for these services in the local community, region, and State;
3. Minimize the time period that the community is without a permanent recreation and competitive pool facility;
4. Provide a facility that supports recreation, training, and all competitive events for up to 4,250 spectators (1,250 permanent interior seats, up to 3,000 temporary exterior seats);
5. Increase programmable water space for recreational swimming to minimize scheduling conflicts with team practices and events;
6. Provide a signature design in a new pool complex that is distinctive, yet appropriate for its seaside location;
7. Accommodate swimming, diving, and water polo national/international events by reflecting current competitive standards, in accordance with FINA regulations;
8. Operate a pool facility that would generate revenue to help offset the ongoing operations and maintenance costs;
9. Implement the land use goals of Planned Development PD-2;
10. Provide a facility that maximizes sustainability and energy efficiency through the use of selected high performance materials;
11. Minimize view disruptions compared to the former Belmont Pool facility;
12. Maximize views to the ocean from inside the facility;
13. Locate the pool in an area that serves the existing users;
14. Design the passive open space with drought tolerant and/or native landscaping and include areas suitable for general community use; and
15. Maintain or increase the amount of open space compared to the former Belmont Pool facility.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In conformance with CEQA, the *State CEQA Guidelines*, and the City of Long Beach policies regarding the implementation of CEQA, the City conducted an extensive environmental review of the proposed Project.

- The City prepared an Initial Study (IS) for the proposed Project to determine the level of environmental documentation required for the proposed Project. The analysis contained in the IS

found that the Project may result in significant environmental impacts without the implementation of mitigation. As such, City staff determined that an EIR was the appropriate environmental document to be prepared for the proposed Project. The IS was prepared and circulated, along with a Notice of Preparation (NOP), from April 18 to May 17, 2013. Subsequent to issuance of the IS/NOP, changes were made to the site design that required the City to revise and reissue the IS. The revised IS was recirculated for public review from April 9 to May 8, 2014. Chapter 2.0, Introduction, of the Draft EIR, describes the issues identified for analysis in the Draft EIR based on the analysis included in the IS, the NOP, and from soliciting public comment.

- The City Council conducted a study session on June 17, 2014, to discuss the programmatic requirements and conceptual plans for the proposed Project. The City Council suggested that a community stakeholder committee be convened to prioritize optional components of the conceptual plan for the City Council to consider for approval. The Stakeholder Advisory Committee consisted of representatives from a number of different stakeholders and representatives for the community at large. The Stakeholder Advisory Committee conducted three workshops in July and August 2014 and explored various issues related to the pool in a collaborative discussion. The Stakeholder Advisory Committee recommended a conceptual design and held a public meeting on September 17, 2014. Draft input was also sought from California Coastal Commission (CCC) local staff. Another public City Council meeting was held October 21, 2014, at which the City Council unanimously approved the recommended programmatic requirement recommended by City staff, and based primarily on the recommendations of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee.

  Prior to the release of the Draft EIR, the City conducted an additional three study sessions with the City's Planning Commission (May 5, 2016), Marine Advisory Commission (May 12, 2016), and City Council (June 14, 2016). The primary intent of these meetings was to engage citizen participation in developing in the proposed Project.

- The City prepared a Draft EIR, which was made available for a 65-day public review period, beginning on April 13, 2016, to June 16, 2016. The City prepared a Final EIR, including the Responses to Comments to the Draft EIR and the Findings of Fact. The Final EIR/Response to Comments contains comments on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments, revisions to the Draft EIR, and appended documents.

C. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the proposed Project consists of the following documents and other evidence, at a minimum:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the proposed Project;
- The Final EIR for the proposed Project;
- The Draft EIR for the proposed Project;
- All written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft EIR;
- All responses to written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft EIR;
- All written and verbal public testimony presented during a noticed public hearing for the proposed Project;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);

- The reports and technical memoranda included or referenced in the Response to Comments;
- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in the Draft EIR and Final EIR;
- The Resolutions adopted by the City in connection with the proposed Project, and all documents incorporated by reference therein, including comments received after the close of the comment period and responses thereto;
- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including but not limited to federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings; and
- Any other relevant materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21167.6(e).

D. CUSTODIAN AND LOCATION OF RECORDS

The documents and other materials that constitute the administrative record for the City's actions related to the proposed Project are located at the City of Long Beach City Hall, 333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor, Long Beach, California 90802. The City Development Services Department is the custodian of the administrative record for the proposed Project. Copies of these documents, which constitute the record of proceedings, are and at all relevant times have been and will be available upon request at the offices of the Development Services Department. This information is provided in compliance with PRC Section 21081.6(a)(2) and Guidelines Section 15091(e).

II. FINDINGS OF FACT

A. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH WERE DETERMINED NOT TO BE POTENTIALLY AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED PROJECT

As a result of the IS that was circulated with the NOP by the City on April 9, 2014, the City determined, based upon the threshold criteria for significance, that the proposed Project would not result in significant potential environmental impacts in several areas; therefore, the City determined that these potential environmental effects would not be addressed in the Draft EIR. Based upon the environmental analysis presented in the Final EIR, and the comments received by the public on the Draft EIR, no substantial evidence has been submitted to or identified by the City that indicates that the proposed Project would have an impact on the following environmental areas:

Aesthetics: Scenic Resources. There are no State Scenic Highways in the City of Long Beach. Although Ocean Boulevard is a proposed Local Scenic Route, it has not been officially designated as a Scenic Route or Scenic Highway. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in impacts related to the damage of scenic resources within a State scenic highway. No impacts are anticipated.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources. The Project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. In addition, the Project site is not zoned, designated, or used for agricultural uses, and no Williamson Act contracts exist for the site. The Project site has previously been graded and has historically been utilized for the Belmont Pool aquatic facilities; it is not, and has not, been used for agricultural purposes. Neither the Project site nor the surrounding areas is zoned or used as forest land, timberland, or for timberland production. The proposed Project would not

result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use nor would it result in the conversion of forest land to a non-forest land use. No impacts are anticipated.

Air Quality: Odors. Objectionable odors may be generated during the operation of diesel-powered construction equipment and/or asphalt paving during Project construction. Those odors would be temporary and would not result in long-term odor impacts. Operation of the proposed Project may also result in the generation of odors related to food service; however, these odors are not expected to be objectionable and would not result in permanent impacts related to odors on adjacent sensitive receptors. No impacts are anticipated.

Biological Resources: Riparian, Sensitive Natural Communities, Wetlands. The Project site is a previously developed property in a heavily urbanized coastal area and is not within a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). No impacts are anticipated.

Biological Resources: Conflict with any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan. There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other habitat conservation plan in the City of Long Beach; therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with any such plans. No impacts are anticipated.

Cultural Resources: Historic Resources. Due to the age of the former Belmont Pool structures and facilities at the time of the NOP (approximately 45 years old), the complex was not considered a historic structure, and no further historic resource evaluation was required. In addition, the former indoor pool was demolished in February 2015, as it was determined to be an imminent threat to public safety. The demolition of the structure was conducted under an emergency permit. As a result, the proposed Project will not cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in PRC Section 15064.5. No impacts are anticipated.

Cultural Resources: Archaeological Resources. An archaeological and historical records review and literature search was conducted on April 4, 2013. The results of the records search indicate that there are no sites within 0.25 mile of the Project site. Based on these results, the potential for on-site archeological resources was determined to be minimal. No impacts are anticipated.

Cultural Resources: Human Remains. There are no known human remains interred on the Project site. In the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during construction, the proper authorities would be notified, and standard procedures for the respectful handling of the human remains activities would be adhered to in compliance with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and PRC Section 5097.98. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Landslides. The proposed Project would not result in impacts associated with landslides because the Project site is relatively flat, and there are no substantial hillsides or unstable slopes immediately adjacent to the site boundary. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Septic Tanks. The proposed Project will not include the use of septic tanks or alternative methods for disposal of wastewater into subsurface soils. No on-site sewage disposal systems (e.g., septic tanks) are planned. The proposed Project would connect to existing public wastewater infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in any impacts related to septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal methods. No impacts are anticipated.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Public Airport or Private Airstrip. There are no public airports, private airports, or private airstrips within 2 miles of the Project site. As a result, the proposed Project would not affect or be affected by aviation activities associated with private airports or airstrips. No impacts are anticipated.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Emergency Access. The proposed Project would not result in changes in the circulation system that would adversely affect the ability of the City of Long Beach Fire Department (LBFD) to implement an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan in this area of the City. No impacts are anticipated.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Wildland Fires. Wildland fires occur in geographic areas that contain the types and conditions of vegetation, topography, weather, and structure density susceptible to risks associated with uncontrolled fires that can be started by lightning, improperly managed camp fires, cigarettes, sparks from automobiles, and other ignition sources. The Project site and the surrounding areas are developed in urban and suburban uses and do not include brush- and grass-covered areas typically found in areas susceptible to wildfires. As a result, the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death associated with wildland fires. No impacts are anticipated.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Housing or Other Structures within 100-year Flood Hazard Area. The proposed Project does not propose the provision of any housing on the Project site. As a result, the proposed Project would not result in the placement of housing or structures within the limits of the 100-year flood. No impacts are anticipated.

Land Use: Divide an Established Community. The existing Project site was previously developed with the former Belmont Pool complex and is surrounded by existing development. The proposed Project would redevelop the Project site with new and expanded Belmont Pool facilities. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in any impacts related to the division of an established community.

Land Use: Conflict with any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan. There is no adopted HCP, NCCP, or other habitat conservation plan within the City of Long Beach; therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with any such plans. No impacts are anticipated.

Mineral Resources. According to the City's General Plan Conservation Element (1973), the primary mineral resources within the City have historically been oil and natural gas. However, over the last century, oil and natural gas extractions have diminished as the resources have become increasingly depleted. The Project site does not contain oil extraction operations and has no other known mineral resources. In addition, implementation of the proposed Project is not anticipated to interfere with resource recovery from other sites that are identified in any general, specific, or land use plan. Therefore, Project implementation would have no impact on mineral resources. No impacts are anticipated.

Noise: Located within an Airport Land Use Plan or within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip. The Project site is not located within 2 miles of a public airport, within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or within an airport land use plan. The proposed Project would not expose employees or visitors of the Project to aviation-related noise levels that would be substantially different from existing conditions. No impacts are anticipated.

Population and Housing: Displace a Substantial Number of People or Housing Units. The proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth because it would not provide new homes or businesses. Furthermore, the proposed Project would not generate a substantial number of new jobs. The

proposed Project would not result in the removal of any existing housing and, therefore, would not require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Because the proposed Project will not displace any existing housing units, it will not displace any residents. As a result, the proposed Project would not result in growth-inducing impacts, displacement of housing or residents, or impacts resulting from the construction of replacement housing. No impacts are anticipated.

Public Services: Police and Fire. The proposed Project would result in an increase in the size and capacity of the Belmont Pool complex. However, as a City facility, it will be staffed by the appropriate number of trained staff, and any incremental increase in both staffing at the site and visitors to the site compared to the existing facility demands would be less than significant and would not warrant new police or fire protection facilities to maintain acceptable response times. No impacts are anticipated.

Public Services: Schools. The proposed Project does not include any residential uses. Pursuant to California Education Code Section 17620(a)(1), the governing board of any school district is authorized to levy a fee, charge, dedication, or other requirement against any construction within the boundaries of the district for the purpose of funding the construction or reconstruction of school facilities. The City would be required to pay such fees to avoid or reduce any impacts of new nonresidential development on school services as provided in Section 65995 of the California Government Code. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 65995, payment of the development fees required by State law provides full and complete mitigation of the Project's impacts on school facilities. No impacts are anticipated.

Public Services: Other Public Facilities (e.g., Libraries). The proposed Project does not include any residential uses and, as such, would not induce substantial population growth that would generate an increased demand for public facilities (e.g., libraries). The proposed Project would not result in a significant increase in staff time for the City's Parks, Recreation, and Marine Department either during construction or operation. Any increases in staff time would be less than significant because the proposed Project is the replacement of the former Belmont Pool facility, which was previously staged by the City's Parks, Recreation, and Marine Department. Therefore, any project-related increase in staff needed to serve the Project would be less than significant and would represent a minor part of the total Department staffing needs. No impacts are anticipated.

Recreation. The Project proposes replacing the currently closed Belmont Pool complex with a new complex that would be able to serve Long Beach residents as well as accommodate a wider range of national and international water sports events. The increased capacity of the Belmont Pool complex as a result of the proposed Project would not result in increased demand at other parks and recreational resources in the City. The proposed Project would not provide any new housing and would not increase the population in the City. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in substantial deterioration of other parks or recreation resources. No impacts are anticipated.

Transportation/Traffic: Result in a Change in Air Traffic Patterns. The Project site is approximately 3 miles southeast of Long Beach Municipal Airport. The heights of the pool building, light standards, and other project features on the site would not be sufficient to require modifications to the existing air traffic patterns at the airport and, therefore, would not affect aviation traffic levels or otherwise result in substantial aviation-related safety risks. No impacts are anticipated.

Transportation/Traffic: Hazard due to a Design Feature. The proposed Project would not result in hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) as these types of features and uses are not included in the proposed Project. No impacts are anticipated.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH WERE DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The Final EIR identified certain less than significant effects that could result from implementation of the proposed Project. No mitigation is required to reduce or avoid such impacts because they would not exceed applicable thresholds of significance.

Aesthetics

Impact: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. There are no locally designated scenic vistas on or surrounding the Project site yet expansive ocean views from public rights-of-way can generally be considered to have aesthetic value. The proposed pool complex would be located generally on the same building footprint of the former Belmont Pool facility. The proposed placement and alignment of the Bubble would allow for increased views of the coastline that were previously blocked by the former Belmont Pool structure. Additionally, the curved elliptical shape of the Bubble reduces the structural scale and mass, when compared to a traditional rectangular building, by eliminating the corners of the building, allowing for an increase in viewable area. Therefore, the change in the building alignment on the site, in combination with the reduced structural mass from the Bubble's elliptical design, would not result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas and a less than significant impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Create a new source of substantial light and glare that would affect day or nighttime views. With adherence to existing Long Beach Municipal Code (LBMC) regulations, light resulting from construction activities would not substantially impact sensitive uses, substantially alter the character of off-site areas surrounding the construction area, or interfere with the performance of an off-site activity. Although operation of the proposed Project would increase the overall intensity of lighting on the site, the increase in lighting would not signify substantial increases in light intensity at off-site locations. Additionally, while the proposed Project's building accents may include metal or other highly polished surfaces around building entrances, such accents would be small relative to the size of the facade and would be partially blocked by landscaping buffers. Additionally, daytime glare and nighttime glare would be reduced due to the obstruction from the proposed landscaping in the interior portions of the Project site. The nighttime glare produced by the signage, exterior lighting, and vehicular headlights would be similar to the existing nighttime glare produced by the surrounding residential and commercial uses and would not result in enough glare to be considered substantial or substantially affect nighttime views. In addition, the interior lighting of the Bubble would not be considered a glare-producing light because the structure would be illuminated from the inside, which would produce a glow and not a direct light. Therefore, the increase in ambient lighting and glare would not interfere with activities or nighttime views in the area, and impacts related to new sources of light and glare would be less than significant.

Impact: Result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant aesthetic impact. The proposed Project is located in an urban area with a number of existing sources of light and glare. Because the proposed Project would replace the former Belmont Pool with a modernized pool complex, light and glare as a result of the proposed Project would be consistent with the baseline conditions in the area and would not substantially impact existing views in the area. The potential aesthetic impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, and existing visual character were evaluated and found to be less than significant. Therefore, the contribution of the proposed Project to potential cumulative visual/aesthetic impacts in the study area is considered less than cumulatively considerable.

Air Quality

Impact: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Because of the region's nonattainment status for ozone (O_3), particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$), and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}), if Project-generated emissions of either of the O_3 precursor pollutants (i.e., reactive organic gases [ROG] and nitrogen oxides [NO_X]), $PM_{2.5}$, or PM_{10} exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) significance thresholds, then the proposed Project would be considered to conflict with the attainment plans. However, the proposed Project would not result in significant operational air quality impacts, contribute to an O_3 exceedance at a nearby monitoring station, or cause the area to be inconsistent with the regional Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Furthermore, because the proposed Project does not require a General Plan Amendment and is consistent with the current site's General Plan land use designation, emissions associated with the proposed Project are not anticipated to exceed the General Plan projections or contribute to air quality deterioration beyond SCAQMD projections. The proposed Project would, however, be required to adhere to Standard Conditions 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, which include a variety of measures aimed at controlling dust during Project construction, consistent with the General Plan Air Quality Element Policy 6.1. In addition, the proposed Project would be built to meet LEED Gold certification standards (or the equivalent) and would implement a variety of conservation and sustainability features aimed at reducing energy consumption, consistent with General Plan policies. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan and Final 2012 AQMP, and related impacts would be less than significant.

Standard Condition 4.2.1: **Construction Emissions.** The proposed Project is required to comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off site. Applicable dust suppression techniques from Rules 403 and 402 are summarized below. Implementation of these dust suppression techniques can reduce the fugitive dust generation (and thus the particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter [PM_{10}] component).

Standard Condition 4.2.2: **Applicable Rules 403 and 402 Measures.** The Project construction contractor shall develop and implement dust-control methods that shall achieve this control level in a SCAQMD Rule 403 dust control plan, designate personnel to monitor the dust control program, and order increased watering, as necessary, to ensure a 55 percent control level. Those duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. Additional control measures to reduce fugitive dust shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Apply water twice daily, or nontoxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces or as needed to areas where soil is disturbed.

- Use low-sulfur fuel for stationary construction equipment. This is required by SCAQMD Rules 431.1 and 431.2.
- During earthmoving or excavation operations, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust-preventive measures using the following procedures:
    - All material excavated shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering, with complete coverage, shall occur at least twice daily, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day.
    - All earthmoving or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e., winds greater than 20 miles per hour [mph] averaged over 1 hour).
    - All material transported off site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
    - The area disturbed by earthmoving or excavation operations shall be minimized at all times.
- After earthmoving or excavation operations, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled using the following measures:
    - Portions of the construction area to remain inactive longer than a period of 3 months shall be revegetated and watered until cover is grown.
    - All active portions of the construction site shall be watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- At all times, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled using the following procedures:
    - On-site vehicle speed shall be limited to 15 mph.
    - Road improvements shall be paved as soon as feasible, watered periodically, or chemically stabilized.
- At all times during the construction phase, ozone precursor emissions from mobile equipment shall be controlled using the following procedures:
    - Equipment engines shall be maintained in good condition and in proper tune according to manufacturers' specifications.
    - On-site mobile equipment shall not be left idling for a period longer than 60 seconds.
- Outdoor storage piles of construction materials shall be kept covered, watered, or otherwise chemically stabilized with a chemical wetting agent to minimize fugitive dust emissions and wind erosion.

Impact: Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. The use of construction equipment on the site would result in localized exhaust emissions. However, the proposed Project would be required to adhere to a variety of measures aimed at controlling

dust during Project construction as required by Standard Conditions 4.2.1 and 4.2.2. Therefore, with incorporation of these SCAQMD Rules and emission control measures, construction emissions would not exceed any of SCAQMD's thresholds. The proposed Project's emissions (from both stationary sources and vehicular sources) would not exceed SCAQMD daily emissions thresholds. Therefore, the long-term air quality impacts of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Standard Condition 4.2.1: **Construction Emissions.** The proposed Project is required to comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off site. Applicable dust suppression techniques from Rules 403 and 402 are summarized below. Implementation of these dust suppression techniques can reduce the fugitive dust generation (and thus the particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter [PM_{10}] component).

Standard Condition 4.2.2: **Applicable Rules 403 and 402 Measures.** The Project construction contractor shall develop and implement dust-control methods that shall achieve this control level in a SCAQMD Rule 403 dust control plan, designate personnel to monitor the dust control program, and order increased watering, as necessary, to ensure a 55 percent control level. Those duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. Additional control measures to reduce fugitive dust shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Apply water twice daily, or nontoxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces or as needed to areas where soil is disturbed.
- Use low-sulfur fuel for stationary construction equipment. This is required by SCAQMD Rules 431.1 and 431.2.
- During earthmoving or excavation operations, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust-preventive measures using the following procedures:
    - All material excavated shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering, with complete coverage, shall occur at least twice daily, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day.
    - All earthmoving or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e., winds greater than 20 miles per hour [mph] averaged over 1 hour).
    - All material transported off site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

- The area disturbed by earthmoving or excavation operations shall be minimized at all times.

- After earthmoving or excavation operations, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled using the following measures:
  - Portions of the construction area to remain inactive longer than a period of 3 months shall be revegetated and watered until cover is grown.
  - All active portions of the construction site shall be watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- At all times, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled using the following procedures:
  - On-site vehicle speed shall be limited to 15 mph.
  - Road improvements shall be paved as soon as feasible, watered periodically, or chemically stabilized.
- At all times during the construction phase, ozone precursor emissions from mobile equipment shall be controlled using the following procedures:
  - Equipment engines shall be maintained in good condition and in proper tune according to manufacturers' specifications.
  - On-site mobile equipment shall not be left idling for a period longer than 60 seconds.
- Outdoor storage piles of construction materials shall be kept covered, watered, or otherwise chemically stabilized with a chemical wetting agent to minimize fugitive dust emissions and wind erosion.

Impact: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Fugitive Dust. Fugitive dust emissions would occur during construction of the proposed Project; however, the proposed Project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Standard Conditions and Rule 403. With adherence to SCAQMD Standard Conditions 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, fugitive dust emissions (particulate matter) would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds of significance. Therefore, no significant impacts to sensitive receptors related to fugitive dust during Project construction would occur.

Other Criteria Pollutants. Carbon monoxide (CO) and NO_X emissions during construction and operation would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds or applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less than significant air quality impacts related to CO, NO_x, or other criteria pollutants and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Long-Term Microscale (CO Hot Spot) Analysis. Because the intersections evaluated for the proposed Project would not be congested and the Project area has low background CO levels, the likelihood for CO concentrations to reach unhealthful levels is low. Therefore, the proposed Project would not have a significant impact on local air quality for CO.

Standard Condition 4.2.1: **Construction Emissions.** The proposed Project is required to comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off site. Applicable dust suppression techniques from Rules 403 and 402 are summarized below. Implementation of these dust suppression techniques can reduce the fugitive dust generation (and thus the particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter [PM_{10}] component).

Standard Condition 4.2.2: **Applicable Rules 403 and 402 Measures.** The Project construction contractor shall develop and implement dust-control methods that shall achieve this control level in a SCAQMD Rule 403 dust control plan, designate personnel to monitor the dust control program, and order increased watering, as necessary, to ensure a 55 percent control level. Those duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. Additional control measures to reduce fugitive dust shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Apply water twice daily, or nontoxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces or as needed to areas where soil is disturbed.
- Use low-sulfur fuel for stationary construction equipment. This is required by SCAQMD Rules 431.1 and 431.2.
- During earthmoving or excavation operations, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust-preventive measures using the following procedures:
    - All material excavated shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering, with complete coverage, shall occur at least twice daily, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day.
    - All earthmoving or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e., winds greater than 20 miles per hour [mph] averaged over 1 hour).
    - All material transported off site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
    - The area disturbed by earthmoving or excavation operations shall be minimized at all times.
- After earthmoving or excavation operations, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled using the following measures:

- Portions of the construction area to remain inactive longer than a period of 3 months shall be revegetated and watered until cover is grown.
- All active portions of the construction site shall be watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

- At all times, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled using the following procedures:
  - On-site vehicle speed shall be limited to 15 mph.
  - Road improvements shall be paved as soon as feasible, watered periodically, or chemically stabilized.
- At all times during the construction phase, ozone precursor emissions from mobile equipment shall be controlled using the following procedures:
  - Equipment engines shall be maintained in good condition and in proper tune according to manufacturers' specifications.
  - On-site mobile equipment shall not be left idling for a period longer than 60 seconds.
- Outdoor storage piles of construction materials shall be kept covered, watered, or otherwise chemically stabilized with a chemical wetting agent to minimize fugitive dust emissions and wind erosion.

Impact: Result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant air quality impact. The cumulative study area for air quality analysis is the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), and air quality conformance is overseen by the SCAQMD. Each project in the Basin is required to comply with SCAQMD rules and regulations. The proposed Project would not result in significant operational air quality impacts, contribute to an O_3 exceedance at a nearby monitoring station, be in noncompliance with the AQMP, or result in a significant health risk for any of the analyzed pollutants. Therefore, the proposed Project's air quality emissions, when considered in combination with the cumulative projects within the Project vicinity, would be incremental and would be considered less than cumulatively considerable. No mitigation would be required.

Biological Resources

Impact: Result in a substantial adverse effect on any special-status species. No sensitive natural community or special-status plant species were identified on the Project site, and no designated critical habitat is located in the Project site. Although the on-site vegetation is nonnative, Allen's hummingbirds were observed foraging on the Project site. However, bird species known to be utilizing the site, including Allen's hummingbird, would be able to relocate to other hunting and foraging habitats once the proposed Project is implemented. The loss of disturbed nonnative habitat and the associated reduction of locally common wildlife populations are not considered a significant impact. The removal of on-site vegetation is not expected to have a significant adverse effect on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, as defined by the CDFW or the USFWS. Therefore, any impacts to sensitive or special-status species would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Geology and Soils

Impact: Result in substantial adverse effects related to the rupture of a known earthquake fault. There are no known active or potentially active faults or fault traces crossing the site. The Project site is not located within a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and there is no evidence of active faulting on or around the immediate Project site. Therefore, the potential for ground rupture to affect the Project site is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Be located on soil that is subject to subsidence. Subsidence began to occur in the City of Long Beach, which sits over the Wilmington Oil Field, in the 1940s, with the pumping of groundwater at the Terminal Island Naval Shipyard. By 1958, the affected area was 20 square miles and extended beyond the Harbor District. Total subsidence reached 29 feet (ft) in the center of the Subsidence Bowl. Water injection was begun in 1958 to repressurize the former oil field and the area has since been stabilized and, therefore, is not expected to result in subsidence at the Project site. As a result, subsidence-related impacts are considered to be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Impact: Be located on expansive soil. The on-site granular soil depths of at least 8 ft are non-expansive, while the underlying clay can be classified as having a moderate expansion potential based on the assessment of the soil classifications in the Geotechnical Evaluations. Therefore, the soils on the Project site are considered to have a non-expansive potential. Impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact: Generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. The proposed Project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from area and mobile sources and indirect emissions from stationary sources associated with energy consumption. The proposed Project would produce an estimated 1,600 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) per year when compared to the existing condition. This does not include any credits for the LEED Gold certification Project features that would reduce energy use and, therefore, reduce GHG emissions from the Project. The proposed Project would produce approximately 2,900 MT of CO_2e per year (when accounting for existing emissions), which would not exceed the Tier 3 criterion of 3,000 MT of CO_2e per year for commercial/residential projects. Therefore, operational emissions would be below the screening threshold and Project operations would be considered to have a less than significant impact related to GHG emissions, and no mitigation is required.

Impact: Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The GHG emissions reduction goals in Assembly Bill (AB 32) are scoped to manage total statewide GHG emissions of approximately 496.95 million metric tons (MMT) of CO_2e per year. The proposed Project is estimated to produce approximately 1,600 MT of CO_2e per year over existing conditions, representing approximately 0.002 MMT of CO_2e per year of the State's reduction goals. Therefore, the proposed Project is not considered to result in GHG emission levels that would substantially conflict with implementation of the GHG reduction goals under AB 32, Executive Order (EO) S-03-05, or other State regulations. The proposed Project would have a less than significant impact related to potential conflicts with regulations outlined in the California Green Buildings Standard Code and GHG emissions reduction goals in AB 32. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in a cumulative greenhouse gas emission impacts. The proposed Project emphasizes energy efficiency and water conservation and would be consistent with the AB 32 reduction goals for 2020; the proposed Project would not generate GHG emissions that exceed any applicable threshold of

significance; and the proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. As a result, the proposed Project's climate change impacts with regard to GHG emissions would not be considered cumulatively considerable because they would not contribute to GHG emissions that exceed the AB 32 Statewide reduction goals. Additionally, the proposed Project's long-term operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD daily thresholds. The proposed Project would result in a GHG emission profile that would not exceed the Tier 3 criterion of 3,000 MT of CO_2e per year for commercial/residential projects, and is lower than the service population thresholds as allowed under Tier 4 analysis (4.8 MT of CO_2e per year per service population). Additionally, since climate change is a global issue, it is unlikely that the proposed Project would generate enough GHG emissions to influence global climate change on its own. Therefore, the contribution of the proposed Project GHG emissions to potential cumulative GHG emission impacts in the City of Long Beach is considered less than cumulatively significant, and no mitigation is required.

According to the Wave Uprush Study (*Wave Uprush Study for Belmont Pool Plaza,* Moffatt & Nichol. October 2014), prepared for the proposed Project, wave run-up for the high 2060 and 2100 sea level rise scenarios would result in a run up elevation up to 8.2 ft and 10.4 ft (or greater), respectively, at the Project site. The modeled scenario does not account for shore protection measures such as beach nourishment, storm berm construction, or other shore protection structures. Furthermore, because the main pool deck would be elevated 17 ft above mean sea level, the pool deck would be set 8.8 ft and 6.6 ft above the projected high water level in 2060 and 2100, respectively. Additional GHG reduction strategies implemented at the State, national, and international levels could reduce sea-level rise. Therefore, impacts related to climate change and sea level rise would not be cumulatively significant.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact: The project site is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The Project site is not included on any hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, including the Cortese List, and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact: Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Due to the depth of groundwater (i.e., 6 to 9 ft below existing grades) and the anticipated depth of excavation (up to 13 ft below existing grade), groundwater dewatering is anticipated to be required during removal of the remaining wooden piles, and construction of the pools. However, groundwater-dewatering activities would be temporary, and the volume of groundwater removed would not be substantial. In addition, grading and construction activities would compact soil, which can decrease infiltration during construction. However, construction activities would also be temporary, and the reduction in infiltration would not be substantial. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater 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.

Operation of the proposed Project would not require groundwater extraction. The proposed Project would not directly utilize local groundwater but would continue to use water from the local municipal supply. Additionally, the proposed Project would replace the existing facility with a similar facility. As discussed previously, the proposed Project would decrease impervious surface by 0.5 acre, which would increase infiltration. As a result, the proposed Project would not constitute interference with groundwater recharge

such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Impacts related to groundwater supplies would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Impact: Flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. The Project site is located within the dam inundation area for the Whittier Narrows Dam, which received a Dam Safety Action Class II rating in December 2008. This rating is assigned to dams where failure could begin during normal operations or be initiated as the consequence of a natural event (e.g., an earthquake). Because of the Project site's location at the furthest point away from the Whittier Narrows Dam within the inundation area, flooding would significantly dissipate by the time it reached the Project site. In addition, the City would have ample time to notify on-site users to evacuate and on-site users would have ample time to evacuate before waters reached the Project site. Additionally, the proposed Project does not propose the development of habitable structures on site, thereby further minimizing the risk to life and property in the event of a dam failure. Furthermore, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has implemented the following Interim Risk Reduction Measures to reduce impacts to life and property in the event of dam failure: remote monitoring, inspection and monitoring, flood mapping, updating the Emergency Action Plan annually, inspecting toe drain and gallery, and initiating a Dam Safety Modification Study. The City has also developed emergency preparedness plans that would help the public be prepared for these types of emergency situations. In addition, the County of Los Angeles has regional catastrophic preparedness planning and regional evacuation routes. Therefore, because the USACE, the City, and the County have implemented mitigation plans, emergency preparedness plans, and evacuation routes, impacts associated with the failure of a dam or levee would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Impact: Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The Project site is not located in the vicinity of any large enclosed bodies of water that could adversely affect the Project site in the event of earthquake-induced seiches. Therefore, the risk associated with possible seiche waves is not considered a potential constraint or a potentially significant impact of the proposed Project, and no mitigation is necessary.

The proposed Project is adjacent to the beach and is within a tsunami inundation zone. However, the proposed Project is replacing an existing use and would not create a new risk of a tsunami occurring. The City has adopted the 2015 Draft Hazard Mitigation Plan (as well as emergency preparedness plans) for the purpose of protecting the community and the environment from natural hazards. In addition, the County of Los Angeles has developed regional catastrophic preparedness planning and regional evacuation routes. Therefore, the risks associated with tsunamis are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

The Project site is relatively level and the absence of nearby slopes precludes any slope stability hazards. Furthermore, the site is not in a State Earthquake-Induced Landslide Hazard Zone. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts related to flooding as a result of inundation by mudflow, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts. Future development within the Project vicinity would be subject to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit requirements for both construction and operation. Each project would be required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and/or a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) to target site-specific pollutants of concern. Each project would also be evaluated individually to determine appropriate BMPs to minimize impacts to surface water quality. Each of the cumulative projects would be required to comply with City and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations and prepare a Floodplain Report during final design to address any potential impacts to the floodplain, and if required, reduce those impacts. In addition, the City Development Services Director reviews all development projects on a case-by-case basis to ensure that

sufficient local and regional drainage capacity is available. Thus, the proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality would be less than cumulatively significant.

Land Use

Impact: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact.

California Coastal Commission/California Coastal Act/Local Coastal Program: The proposed Project is consistent with the policies and guidelines contained in the City's Local Coastal Program (LCP) and the policies within Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Southern California Association of Governments Regional Comprehensive Plan: The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) maintains an Intergovernmental Review Criteria List to assist agencies in determining whether a project is considered regionally significant. The proposed Project is not listed by SCAG as a project of regional significance. In addition, SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) aims to reduce emissions and increase mobility through strategic land use changes. The proposed Project is a replacement/expansion of previous recreational facilities and would not alter the designated or previous land uses on the Project site. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the intent of the goals and policies outlined in SCAG's RCP, and no mitigation is required.

General Plan Land Use Element: The City's General Plan land use designations for the Project site are Land Use Division (LUD) No. 7, Mixed-Use, and LUD No. 11, Open Space and Parks. LUD No. 7 is intended for large vital activity centers, including visitor-serving uses and recreation uses. Permitted uses within LUD No. 11 include visitor-serving facilities and recreational uses, among other uses. The proposed Project includes the replacement of the former facility and construction of the new Belmont Pool complex, which is a visitor-serving recreational use consistent with both LUD No. 7 and LUD No. 11. The proposed Project also includes an open space/park area (a park use), an outdoor café (a retail use) and gathering area, and public restrooms, consistent with permitted land uses as allowed within LUD No. 7. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan land use designations for the Project Site. The proposed Project would also be consistent with applicable goals and policies outlined in the City's current General Plan Land Use Element and with the goals, policies, and designations outlined in the City's proposed Land Use Element. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in significant land use compatibility issues with the City's General Plan Land Use Element.

General Plan Open Space and Recreation Element: The City's Open Space and Recreation Element defines the Belmont Pool complex as a special-use park because of the numerous recreational amenities and specialized aquatic uses it has provided. The proposed Project would be consistent with the objectives and policies established in the General Plan Open Space and Recreation Element for the Project area because the proposed Project would enhance recreation opportunities and facilities on the Project site. Therefore, no adverse impacts to open space and recreation amenities would result, and mitigation would not be required.

Impact: Result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant land use impact. The Development of the proposed Project would be consistent with the existing General Plan land use designations. The land use patterns around the Project site have been long established with recreational, open space, and small areas of retail (food and concession areas) development. The proposed Project

involves replacement of a former pool facility and would be compatible with development in the immediate area surrounding the Project site. Therefore, the construction of the new Belmont Pool facilities would not result in a potential inconsistency with the City General Plan or other land planning documents, nor would the proposed Project result in significant land use compatibility issues. Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in, or contribute to, a cumulatively significant land use impact, and no mitigation is required.

Noise

Impact: Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by the City of Long Beach.

Traffic Noise. Project-related traffic noise levels would have a traffic noise increase of up to 2.4 A-weighted decibels (dBA), except for Bennett Avenue south of Ocean Boulevard. Although traffic noise levels along Bennett Avenue south of Ocean Boulevard would increase by up to 7.2 dBA, this roadway segment is the entrance to the proposed Project, and there are no off-site noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to this segment of the road. The traffic noise increases of up to 2.4 dBA along other roadway segments in the vicinity of the Project site are less than the 3 dBA threshold normally perceptible by the human ear in an outdoor environment. Therefore, no significant traffic noise impacts would occur on off-site noise-sensitive land uses.

Long-Term Operation. Noise levels generated from the outdoor pool under normal operations would be less than 50 dBA L_{eq} (equivalent continuous sound level measured in A-weighted decibels) at the perimeter of the facility. Noise levels generated from the indoor pool would not impact the closest residences at the Belmont Shore Condominiums, which is approximately 180 ft from the building edge of the proposed Project because the combination of building attenuation and distance attenuation would be 46 dBA. Therefore, noise generated under normal operations and from the indoor pool would not have the potential to impact nearby noise-sensitive uses.

Interior Noise. Noise levels at the outdoor seating area would not exceed any of the City's daytime interior standards at either the Belmont Shores Children's Center or the two residential locations. In addition, because the proposed Project would not be used after 10:00 p.m., no nighttime operational noise would occur and, therefore, no violation of the City's nighttime noise standards would occur.

Impact: Expose persons to or generate excess groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. The primary source of vibration during construction would be generated by front-end loaders, small bulldozers, dump trucks, hydraulic hammers, and pile drivers. The estimated vibration level at the closest receptors would be 0.049 inch/second and 0.097 inch/second, for residences to the northeast and northwest, respectively, and 0.101 inch/second at the Belmont Shores Children's Center and other commercial buildings. These construction vibration levels are below the damage threshold of 0.3 inch/second for older residential buildings and 0.5 inch/second for modern industrial commercial buildings. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Project-related traffic noise levels would have a traffic noise increase of up to 2.4 dBA, except for Bennett Avenue south of Ocean Boulevard. Although traffic noise levels along Bennett Avenue south of Ocean Boulevard would increase by up to 7.2 dBA, this roadway segment is the entrance to the proposed Project and there are no off-site noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to it. The traffic noise increases of up to 2.4 dBA along other roadway segments in the Project area are less than the 3 dBA threshold normally perceptible by the

human ear in an outdoor environment. Therefore, no significant traffic noise impacts or permanent increase in ambient noise levels would occur in the Project vicinity or to off-site noise-sensitive land uses.

Impact: Result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant noise impact. There are no proposed or approved (but not yet fully constructed) projects within the cumulative noise study area for the proposed Project. Because construction noise and vibration are localized and rapidly attenuate within an urban environment, other related projects are located too far from the Project site to contribute to cumulative impacts related to noise levels due to construction activities. Construction activity at any related Project site would not result in a noticeable increase in noise to sensitive receptors adjacent to the proposed Project site. Furthermore, all related projects would be required to comply with the City's Noise Control Ordinance. Therefore, construction noise impacts would be less than cumulatively significant.

Operations associated with the proposed Project are not anticipated to lead to a substantial increase in the number of visitors and vehicles to the Project site. Therefore, the long-term ambient noise levels associated with increased traffic are not anticipated to be significant as a result of the proposed Project, would not contribute substantially to cumulative roadway noise impacts, and would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact. Also, since no cumulative projects were identified for the cumulative noise study area, the proposed Project would not contribute to off-site cumulative noise impacts from on-site activities and would have a less than cumulatively considerable noise impact.

Recreation

Impact: Result in a cumulative recreation impact. The proposed Project, in conjunction with the cumulative projects in the City, would contribute to the recreational opportunities in the City. The proposed Project is not anticipated to significantly increase the use or need for additional City park facilities. Furthermore, the proposed Project does not include any residential housing or a substantial increase in long-term employment opportunities that would increase the population in the City. Therefore, the proposed Project would not, with any other planned or proposed projects, cumulatively contribute to the increased use of or need for additional or expanded recreational facilities in the City. Therefore, the proposed Project would not contribute to adverse cumulative impacts related to recreation when combined with other foreseeable projects that are planned or expected to occur in the City of Long Beach or the region.

Transportation and Circulation

Impact: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program. None of the arterial monitoring stations identified the 2010 Congestion Management Plan (CMP) for the County of Los Angeles are located near the Project site, and the proposed Project is not anticipated to conflict with standards established for CMP-designated roads or highways. The proposed Project would have a less than significant impact relative to the adopted CMP, and no mitigation is required.

Impact: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. The proposed Project would reconstruct the Belmont Pool at the existing location, which is near a public transit stop and a Class I bike path. Existing pathways through the passive park would be rerouted to East Olympic Plaza to allow for utilization of the proposed pedestrian and bicycle enhancements. The facility would continue to be accessible for users of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes of travel because the site design allows for pedestrian linkages. The proposed pool facility would continue to be accessed via Long Beach Transit bus service as well as sidewalks and the Shoreline Beach

Bike Path. The proposed Project would have less than significant impacts relative to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, and no mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in a cumulatively significant transportation/traffic impact. One project was identified within the cumulative Project study area: the Leeway Sailing Center Pier Replacement. This project is proposing to reconstruct the existing pier without expanding the size of the existing operation. Therefore, this project will not contribute new traffic to any of the study area intersections. Because no additional traffic from cumulative projects is anticipated at the study area intersections, no additional cumulative operational traffic impacts would occur. No mitigation is required.

Utilities

Impact: The following impacts are discussed together in the Draft EIR and Final EIR; each bullet point represents a potential environmental impact that is discussed below.

- **Require or result in construction of new water facilities or the expansion of existing facilities**
- **Necessitate new or expanded water entitlements.**

The Long Beach Water Department (LBWD) provided water services to the previous pool complex and pool facilities and would continue to provide water to the Project site. A short-term demand for water would occur during construction associated with excavation, grading, and other construction-related activities on the Project site. However, this short-term demand is anticipated to be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

The proposed Project would result in an increase in water service/demand, which would represent approximately 0.027 percent of the LBWD water supply, which would be within the available and projected water supplies of the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). In addition, the proposed Project would comply with State law regarding water conservation measures and would also incorporate additional water conservation measures to meet the standards associated with the LEED Gold rating. Therefore, impacts associated with the long-term operation of the proposed Project would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

The proposed Project would be required to pay fees pursuant to Chapter 18.23 of the Fire Code and the implementation of applicable building code requirements in accordance with the California Fire Code, thereby ensuring the LBFD would be able to maintain acceptable performance ratios and fire flow requirements following Project implementation. Potential impacts related to fire flow would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

- **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.**

Groundwater-dewatering activities during Project construction would be temporary, and the volume of groundwater removed would not be substantial. In addition, the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) would ensure they have adequate capacity to accommodate the discharged groundwater prior to issuing a permit. Therefore, potential impacts to wastewater treatment and wastewater conveyance infrastructure would be less than significant during construction, and no mitigation is required.

Wastewater flow from the proposed Project would require approximately 0.33 percent of the existing available design capacity of the Anaheim Street Trunk Sewer and 0.27 percent of the existing available design capacity Joint Outfall C Unit Trunk Sewer. Both trunk sewers have sufficient capacity to accommodate anticipated wastewater flows from the proposed Project. The anticipated increase in daily wastewater flow would also represent 0.06 percent of the anticipated available daily capacity of the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP). The proposed Project would not substantially or incrementally exceed the current or future scheduled capacity of the JWPCP by generating flows greater than those anticipated. In addition, the projected wastewater flow calculations for the proposed Project do not account for the implementation of water conservation measures proposed by the City, which would further reduce wastewater flows beyond the projections noted above. Impacts related to wastewater treatment would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Impact: Insufficient permitted capacity at landfill. Construction and operational solid waste would be disposed of at the Southeast Resource Recovery Facility (SERRF) because it is the closest active solid waste facility to the Project site. The Solid Waste Facility Permit from the County of Los Angeles Solid Waste Management Program for the SERRF authorizes the disposal of a maximum of 2,240 tons of waste per day. Currently, the SERRF accepts approximately 1,320 tons of waste per day. The volume of solid waste that would be generated by the proposed Project would require approximately 0.11 percent of the currently available daily capacity at the SERRF. Any solid waste considered unprocessible by SERRF would likely be taken to the Mesquite Landfill. The Mesquite Landfill is authorized to accept approximately 20,000 tons of waste per day. The anticipated increase in solid waste disposal attributable to the proposed Project would require 0.005 percent of the available daily disposal capacity at the Mesquite Landfill. Impacts related to solid waste would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Fail to comply with federal, State, and local statues and regulations regarding solid waste. Waste diversion for the proposed Project is anticipated to be consistent with other similar development within the City and divert a high percentage of trash from landfills based on compliance with standard City practices and regulations. In addition, the Project would adhere to a Construction & Demolition (C&D) waste recycling program during construction. The City's C&D Debris Recycling Program requires at least 60 percent of C&D waste (e.g., concrete, metals, and asphalt) to be recycled. Additionally, the proposed Project would include on-site recycling containers and adequate storage area for such containers. All containers and storage areas on the Project site would be sized in accordance with the applicable provisions in the LBMC, including Sections 8.60.025 and 8.60.020, which establish standards and guidelines regarding refuse and recycling receptacles. Based on these considerations, the proposed Project would be consistent with the State Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991. Therefore, with compliance with applicable City codes and State regulations, the proposed Project would not conflict with solid waste regulations, plans, and programs. Impacts related to consistency with applicable federal, State, and local statutes and regulations addressing solid waste would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new of physically altered energy transmission facilities.

Electricity. New development on site would result in an increase in long-term demand for electricity. The anticipated increase in Project-related annual electricity consumption would represent approximately 0.0004 percent of the forecasted net energy load for the Southern California Edison (SCE) service. Based on these estimates, sufficient transmission and distribution capacity exists, and off-site improvements would not be necessary. Furthermore, because the Project site is currently served by all utilities and has

previously operated with the same land use as proposed, no new off-site service lines or substations would be required to serve the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts related to the provision of electricity services to the proposed Project would be less than significant, and the proposed Project would not require new or physically altered transmission facilities (other than those facilities needed for on-site distribution and hook-up into the existing system). Similarly, no significant impacts to local or regional supplies of electricity would occur as a result of the proposed Project, and no mitigation is required.

Natural Gas. The proposed Project, which has a larger building area than the former pool complex, would result in an increase in long-term demand for natural gas. The proposed Project would generate an annual natural gas demand of 0.00229 billion cubic feet (bcf) per year, which is an increase of 0.00133 bcf per year, which would fall well within the capacity of the service provider, Long Beach Gas & Oil (LBGO) until at least the year 2035. The proposed Project would further reduce natural gas consumption through the installation of high-efficiency direct fire heating and pool blankets. No new off-site service lines or substations would be required to serve the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts related to the provision of natural gas services to the proposed Project would be less than significant, and the proposed Project would not require new or physically altered transmission facilities (other than those facilities needed for on-site distribution and hook-up into the existing system). Similarly, no significant impacts to local or regional supplies of natural gas would occur as a result of the proposed Project, and no mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant utilities and service system impact.

Electricity. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of impacts to the provision of electricity is the service territory of SCE. Although the proposed Project has the potential to increase electrical demand in the area, SCE has identified adequate capacity to handle increase in electrical demand, and any increase in electrical demand resulting from the proposed Project would be incremental compared to an increase in regional electrical demand. Compliance with Title 24 of the California Administrative Code regulates energy consumption in new construction and regulates building energy consumption for heating, cooling, ventilation, water heating, and lighting for the proposed Project and all future projects. In addition, the proposed Project would be designed to meet LEED Gold standards, including a number of energy-efficient measures to further reduce energy consumption. Therefore, in relation to the cumulative study area, the proposed Project's incremental contribution to increased demand for electricity would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation is required.

Natural Gas. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of impacts to the provision of natural gas is the service territory for the LBGO. According to the 2014 California Gas Report, the City's gas use is expected to remain constant through 2035. Sufficient gas supplies and infrastructure capacity are available, or have already been planned, to serve past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects. Further, all future projects would be subject to Title 24 requirements and would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine the need for specific distribution infrastructure improvements. As there is adequate capacity and additional development within LBGO's service area that would comply with Title 24, the proposed Project's contribution to cumulative natural gas impacts would be considered less than significant.

Solid Waste. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of impacts to solid waste disposal capacity is the County of Los Angeles. The proposed Project in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within the County would create an increased demand on landfills and solid waste services for the County. The construction and operation of the proposed Project would be

served by the SERRF, a refuse-to-energy waste facility with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs. Solid waste considered unprocessable by SERRF would be taken to landfills in Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties. Therefore, the proposed Project would not have a significant Project-specific or cumulative impact on waste disposal capacity at County transformation facilities and landfills. In addition, the City complies with all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and no mitigation is required.

Wastewater. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis for wastewater treatment is defined as the City and the LACSD service territory. Because LACSD projects that its existing and planned wastewater treatment capacity would be sufficient to accommodate the growth forecasted by the United States Census Bureau within its service area, development that is generally consistent with this forecast can be adequately served by LACSD facilities. The proposed Project would replace and improve the previous Belmont Pool Facilities; no change in land use is proposed. LACSD existing facilities have the capacity to accommodate past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects. The proposed Project would not contribute wastewater that would exceed the service capacity of LACSD. Therefore, the proposed Project would not significantly contribute to or cause cumulative impacts to wastewater services, and no mitigation is required.

Water. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of water infrastructure includes the Project site and the service territory of the City. According to the City's UWMP, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California's (MWDSC) future water supplies are fairly reliable as documented in its 2010 Regional UWMP, because the MWDSC current allocation plan guarantees an amount of water close to the LBWD's need for water, and because the LBWD has a preferential right to the MWDSC supplies in excess of its need for that water. In addition, LBWD projects that there are sufficient groundwater supplies to meet any future demand requirements in the City. Therefore, existing water systems have sufficient capacity to meet the additional maximum day and peak-hour domestic water demand and fire flow demand from the proposed Project and other proposed projects within the City's service territory through 2020. As such, the potential cumulative impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects related to water supply within the City would be less than significant.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH WERE DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION

The Final EIR identified certain potentially significant effects that could result from the proposed Project. However, the Long Beach Planning Commission finds for each of the significant or potentially significant impacts identified in this section, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that changes or alterations have been required or incorporated into the proposed Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects as identified in the Final EIR. As a result, adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below would reduce the identified significant effects to a less than significant level.

Aesthetics

Impact: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

During construction, temporary fencing would be placed along the perimeter of the site to screen construction activities from the street level. It is recognized that construction fencing could potentially serve as a target for graffiti if not appropriately monitored. Such graffiti could result in the degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Mitigation Measure 4.1.1 would

require that temporary barriers and walkways are maintained in a visually attractive manner throughout the construction period. Mitigation requiring the maintenance of the Project site fencing would ensure that impacts associated with unwanted debris and graffiti would be less than significant.

As a result of implementation of the proposed Project, the existing visual character of the Project site would be changed because the proposed design would be dramatically different than the former Belmont Pool facility. Although the proposed development represents a substantial change from the existing condition, the proposed Project design has a comparable mass, scale, and height and would also be aligned to provide for increased coastal views. Additionally, the proposed Project would replace one large recreational pool complex with another recreational pool complex and although the design would be different, the visual character of the Project site would not be substantially degraded with the implementation of the proposed Project. Project impacts would be less than significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measure 4.1.1: **Maintenance of Construction Barriers.** Prior to issuance of any construction permits, the City of Long Beach (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that construction plans include the following note: During construction, the Construction Contractor shall ensure, through appropriate postings and daily visual inspections, that no unauthorized materials are posted on any temporary construction barriers or temporary pedestrian walkways, and that any such temporary barriers and walkways are maintained in a visually attractive manner. In the event that unauthorized materials or markings are discovered on any temporary construction barrier or temporary pedestrian walkway, the Construction Contractor shall remove such items within 48 hours.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to the degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site during construction to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Biological Resources

Impact: Result in substantial interference with the movement or migration of wildlife species or wildlife nursery sites. Existing landscaping may provide suitable habitat for nesting birds including those protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). A total of 30 trees on the Project site would be removed or relocated under the proposed Project. These existing trees may provide habitat for nesting birds. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would be subject to the provisions of the MBTA, which prohibits disturbing or destroying active nests. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3.1, potentially significant impacts to nesting birds would be reduced to a level considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.1: **Migratory Bird Treaty Act.** Tree and vegetation removal shall be restricted to outside the likely active nesting season (January 15 through September 1) for those bird species present or potentially occurring within the proposed Project area. That time period is inclusive of most other birds' nesting periods, thus maximizing avoidance of impacts to any nesting birds. If construction is proposed between January 15 and September 1, a qualified biologist familiar with local avian species and the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the

California Fish and Game Code shall conduct a preconstruction survey for nesting birds no more than 3 days prior to construction. The survey shall include the entire area that will be disturbed. The results of the survey shall be recorded in a memorandum and submitted to the City of Long Beach (City) Parks, Recreation, and Marine Director within 48 hours. If the survey is positive, and the nesting species are subject to the MBTA or the California Fish and Game Code, the memorandum shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine appropriate action. If nesting birds are present, a qualified biologist shall be retained to monitor the site during initial vegetation clearing and grading, as well as during other activities that would have the potential to disrupt nesting behavior. The monitor shall be empowered by the City to halt construction work in the vicinity of the nesting birds if the monitor believes the nest is at risk of failure or the birds are excessively disturbed.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to the movement or migration of wildlife species or wildlife nursery sites to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Conflict with a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Construction of the pool facilities as currently planned would result in removal or relocation of 30 trees. In accordance with Chapter 14.28 of the City's Municipal Code, a ministerial permit from the Public Works Director would be required before the removal of any trees on City-owned property. The City's Tree Maintenance Policy requires a 1:1 replacement ratio and payment of a fee that is equivalent to the cost of a City-approved 15-gallon tree. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3.2, impacts related to the City's tree protection ordinance would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.2: **Local Tree Removal Ordinances.** Prior to the start of any demolition or construction activities, the City of Long Beach (City) Parks, Recreation, and Marine Director, or designee, shall obtain a tree removal permit from the City's Public Works Director. A City-approved Construction Plan shall be submitted with the permit to remove tree(s). The City-approved Plan shall show that the existing City (parkway) tree has a direct impact on the design and function of the proposed Project. The City shall incur all removal costs, including site cleanup, make any necessary repair of hardscape damage, and replace the tree. The removed tree shall be replaced with an approved 15-gallon tree and payment of a fee that is equivalent to a City-approved 15-gallon tree.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to conflicts with a tree removal ordinance to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Result in a cumulative impact to biological resources. The proposed Project would be required to comply with Mitigation Measures 4.3.1 and 4.3.2, requiring avoidance of construction during nesting season and replacement of removed trees at a 1:1 ratio and payment of a fee, and would reduce potential impacts to migratory bird species to a less than significant level. Therefore, overall adverse impacts to nesting migratory bird species would not be cumulatively significant.

The Project site does not contain any native habitat, and is in an area with substantial urban development and limited native habitat. Therefore, loss of potential habitat on the Project site would not be a substantial impact. As a result, when considered with the potential effects of other development in this part of the City on biological resources, the proposed Project would not contribute appreciably to cumulative adverse impacts on biological resources. Therefore, the contribution of the proposed Project to cumulative adverse impacts on biological resources would be considered less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.1: **Migratory Bird Treaty Act.** Tree and vegetation removal shall be restricted to outside the likely active nesting season (January 15 through September 1) for those bird species present or potentially occurring within the proposed Project area. That time period is inclusive of most other birds' nesting periods, thus maximizing avoidance of impacts to any nesting birds. If construction is proposed between January 15 and September 1, a qualified biologist familiar with local avian species and the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code shall conduct a preconstruction survey for nesting birds no more than 3 days prior to construction. The survey shall include the entire area that will be disturbed. The results of the survey shall be recorded in a memorandum and submitted to the City of Long Beach (City) Parks, Recreation, and Marine Director within 48 hours. If the survey is positive, and the nesting species are subject to the MBTA or the California Fish and Game Code, the memorandum shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine appropriate action. If nesting birds are present, a qualified biologist shall be retained to monitor the site during initial vegetation clearing and grading, as well as during other activities that would have the potential to disrupt nesting behavior. The monitor shall be empowered by the City to halt construction work in the vicinity of the nesting birds if the monitor believes the nest is at risk of failure or the birds are excessively disturbed.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.2: **Local Tree Removal Ordinances.** Prior to the start of any demolition or construction activities, the City of Long Beach (City) Parks, Recreation, and Marine Director, or designee, shall obtain a tree removal permit from the City's Public Works Director. A City-approved Construction Plan shall be submitted with the permit to remove tree(s). The City-approved Plan shall show that the existing City (parkway) tree has a direct impact on the design and function of the proposed Project. The City shall incur all removal costs, including site cleanup, make any necessary repair of hardscape damage, and replace the tree. The removed tree shall be replaced with an approved 15-gallon tree and payment of a fee that is equivalent to a City-approved 15-gallon tree.

Finding: Mitigation Measures 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant cumulative impacts related to biological resources to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Cultural Resources

Impact: Destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. During Project construction, there is a potential for significant fossil remains to be encountered during grading activities at depths of 23 ft or greater. Mitigation Measure 4.4.1 requires a qualified paleontologist to be retained to monitor grading activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4.1 would ensure that impacts to paleontological resources are reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.4.1: **Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program.** Prior to commencement of any grading or excavation activity on site, the City of Long Beach (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that a paleontologist has been retained on an on-call basis for all excavation from the surface to depths of 23 feet (ft) below the surface. Once a depth of 23 ft is reached, the paleontologist shall visit the site and determine if there is a potential for the sediments at this depth to contain paleontological resources.

A paleontologist shall not be required on site if excavation is only occurring in depths of less than 23 ft, unless there are discoveries at shallower depths that warrant the presence of a paleontological monitor. In the event that there are any unanticipated discoveries, the on-call paleontologist shall be called to the site to assess the find for significance, and if necessary, prepare a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) as outlined below.

If excavation will extend deeper than 23 ft, exclusive of pile-driving and vibro-replacement soil stabilization techniques, the paleontologist shall prepare a PRIMP for the proposed Project. The PRIMP should be consistent with the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists (SVP, 1995 and 2010) and shall include but not be limited to the following:

- Attendance at the pre-grade conference or weekly tailgate meeting if the PRIMP is initiated after the commencement of grading, in order to explain the mitigation measures associated with the Project.
- During construction excavation, a qualified vertebrate paleontological monitor shall initially be present on a full-time basis whenever excavation shall occur within the sediments that have a high paleontological sensitivity rating. Based on the significance of any recovered specimens, the qualified paleontologist may set up conditions that shall allow for monitoring to be scaled back to part-time as the Project progresses. However, if significant fossils begin to be recovered after monitoring has been scaled back, conditions shall also be specified that would allow increased monitoring as necessary. The monitor shall be equipped to salvage fossils and/or matrix samples as they are unearthed in order to avoid construction delays. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment in the area of the find in order to allow removal of abundant or large specimens.

- The underlying sediments may contain abundant fossil remains that can only be recovered by a screening and picking matrix; therefore, these sediments shall occasionally be spot-screened through 1/8 to 1/20-inch mesh screens to determine whether microfossils exist. If microfossils are encountered, additional sediment samples (up to 6,000 pounds) shall be collected and processed through 1/20-inch mesh screens to recover additional fossils. Processing of large bulk samples is best accomplished at a designated location within the Project that shall be accessible throughout the Project duration but shall also be away from any proposed cut or fill areas. Processing is usually completed concurrently with construction, with the intent to have all processing completed before, or just after, Project completion. A small corner of a staging or equipment parking area is an ideal location. If water is not available, the location should be accessible for a water truck to occasionally fill containers with water.
- Preparation of recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation. This includes the washing and picking of mass samples to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils and the removal of surplus sediment from around larger specimens to reduce the volume of storage for the repository and the storage cost.
- Identification and curation of specimens into a museum repository with permanent retrievable storage, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (LACM).
- Preparation of a report of findings with an appended itemized inventory of specimens. When submitted to the City Development Services Director, or designee, the report and inventory would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to paleontological resources discovered during Project construction to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cultural resources impact. The proposed Project, in conjunction with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects, has the potential to contribute to a cumulative impact due to the loss of undiscovered paleontological and archaeological resources during grading and construction activity. Incorporation of Mitigation Measure 4.4.1 will reduce the proposed Project's incremental contribution to this potential cumulative impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.4.1: **Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program.** Prior to commencement of any grading or excavation activity on site, the City of Long Beach (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that a paleontologist has been retained on an on-call basis for all excavation from the surface to depths of 23 feet (ft) below the surface. Once a depth of 23 ft is reached, the paleontologist shall visit the site and determine if there is a potential for the sediments at this depth to contain paleontological resources.

A paleontologist shall not be required on site if excavation is only occurring in depths of less than 23 ft, unless there are discoveries at shallower depths that warrant the presence of a paleontological monitor. In the event that there are any unanticipated discoveries, the on-call paleontologist shall be called to the site to assess the find for significance, and if necessary, prepare a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) as outlined below.

If excavation will extend deeper than 23 ft, exclusive of pile-driving and vibro-replacement soil stabilization techniques, the paleontologist shall prepare a PRIMP for the proposed Project. The PRIMP should be consistent with the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists (SVP, 1995 and 2010) and shall include but not be limited to the following:

- Attendance at the pre-grade conference or weekly tailgate meeting if the PRIMP is initiated after the commencement of grading, in order to explain the mitigation measures associated with the Project.
- During construction excavation, a qualified vertebrate paleontological monitor shall initially be present on a full-time basis whenever excavation shall occur within the sediments that have a high paleontological sensitivity rating. Based on the significance of any recovered specimens, the qualified paleontologist may set up conditions that shall allow for monitoring to be scaled back to part-time as the Project progresses. However, if significant fossils begin to be recovered after monitoring has been scaled back, conditions shall also be specified that would allow increased monitoring as necessary. The monitor shall be equipped to salvage fossils and/or matrix samples as they are unearthed in order to avoid construction delays. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment in the area of the find in order to allow removal of abundant or large specimens.
- The underlying sediments may contain abundant fossil remains that can only be recovered by a screening and picking matrix; therefore, these sediments shall occasionally be spot-screened through 1/8 to 1/20-inch mesh screens to determine whether microfossils exist. If microfossils are encountered, additional sediment samples (up to 6,000 pounds) shall be collected and processed through 1/20-inch mesh screens to recover additional fossils. Processing of large bulk samples is best accomplished at a designated location within the Project that shall be accessible throughout the Project duration but shall also be away from any proposed cut or fill areas. Processing is usually completed concurrently with construction, with the intent to have all processing completed before, or just after, Project completion. A small corner of a staging or equipment parking area is an ideal location. If water is not available, the location should be accessible for a water truck to occasionally fill containers with water.

- Preparation of recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation. This includes the washing and picking of mass samples to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils and the removal of surplus sediment from around larger specimens to reduce the volume of storage for the repository and the storage cost.
- Identification and curation of specimens into a museum repository with permanent retrievable storage, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (LACM).
- Preparation of a report of findings with an appended itemized inventory of specimens. When submitted to the City Development Services Director, or designee, the report and inventory would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce the proposed Project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact to cultural resources to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Geology and Soils

Impact: Result in substantial adverse effects related to strong seismic ground shaking. The site is located approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Newport-Inglewood Structural Zone. Significant ground shaking or secondary seismic ground deformation effects could occur at the site should a major seismic event occur along the Newport-Inglewood Structural Zone. As with most areas in Southern California, damage to the proposed Belmont Pool facilities and infrastructure could be expected as a result of significant ground shaking during a strong seismic event in the region. However, the proposed Project structures would be designed and built in conformance with the most current adopted California Building Code (CBC), including seismic safety standards. Mitigation Measure 4.5.1 requires the City to comply with the recommendations of the Geotechnical Evaluations and the most current CBC, which stipulates appropriate seismic design provisions that shall be implemented with Project design and construction. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.1, potential Project impacts related to seismic ground shaking would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.5.1: **Conformance with the Project Geotechnical Studies.** All grading operations and construction shall be conducted in conformance with the recommendations included in the *Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for the Proposed Belmont Plaza Olympic Pool Revitalization Project,* prepared by MACTEC (April 14, 2009); the *Geotechnical Investigation for the Temporary Myrtha Pool and Associated Improvements, Belmont Plaza Revitalization,* prepared by GMU Geotechnical, Inc. (April 3, 2013); the *Preliminary Geotechnical Report for the Belmont Plaza Pool Rebuild-Revitalization* prepared by AESCO (April 24, 2014); and *Soil Corrosivity Evaluation for the Belmont Plaza Pool Facility Rebuild/Revitalization Project*, prepared by HDR Schiff (April 23, 2014), which together are referred to as the *Geotechnical Evaluations.* Design, grading, and construction shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of the City of Long Beach (City) Municipal Code (Title 18) and the California Building Code (CBC) applicable at the time of grading, appropriate local grading

regulations, and the requirements of the Project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final written report, subject to review and approval by the Development Services Director, or designee, prior to commencement of grading activities.

Specific requirements in the Final Geotechnical Report shall address:

1. Seismic design considerations and requirements for structures and nonstructural components permanently attached to structures
2. Foundations including ground improvements (deep soil mixing and stone columns) and shallow foundation design
3. Earthwork, including site preparation for structural areas (building pad) and sidewalks, pavements, and other flatwork areas; fill material; temporary excavations; and trench backfill
4. Liquefaction
5. Site drainage
6. Slabs-on-grade and pavements
7. Retaining walls

Additional site testing and final design evaluation shall be conducted by the Project geotechnical consultant to refine and enhance these requirements, if necessary. The City shall require the Project geotechnical consultant to assess whether the requirements in that report need to be modified or refined to address any changes in the Project features that occur prior to the start of grading. If the Project geotechnical consultant identifies modifications or refinements to the requirements, the City shall require appropriate changes to the final Project design and specifications.

Grading plan review shall also be conducted by the City's Development Services Director, or designee, prior to the start of grading to verify that the requirements developed during the geotechnical design evaluation have been appropriately incorporated into the Project plans. Design, grading, and construction shall be conducted in accordance with the specifications of the Project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final report based on the CBC applicable at the time of grading and building and the City Building Code. On-site inspection during grading shall be conducted by the Project geotechnical consultant and the City Building Official to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into Project plans.

Finding: The mitigation measures are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Result in substantial adverse effects related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. The Project site is within a State of California Hazard Zone for Liquefaction. The

liquefaction evaluation performed as part of the Draft Geotechnical Study determined there is potential for liquefaction in the loose- to medium-dense sandy silt, silty sand, and sand at the Project site. As a result, the Project site and the development proposed for the Project site would be subject to impacts related to liquefaction of the on-site soils as a result of seismic shaking, and mitigation is required. Mitigation Measure 4.5.1 requires the City to comply with the recommendations of the Project Geotechnical Study, which stipulates appropriate seismic design provisions that shall be implemented with Project design and construction. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.1, potential Project impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.5.1: **Conformance with the Project Geotechnical Studies.** All grading operations and construction shall be conducted in conformance with the recommendations included in the *Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for the Proposed Belmont Plaza Olympic Pool Revitalization Project,* prepared by MACTEC (April 14, 2009); the *Geotechnical Investigation for the Temporary Myrtha Pool and Associated Improvements, Belmont Plaza Revitalization,* prepared by GMU Geotechnical, Inc. (April 3, 2013); the *Preliminary Geotechnical Report for the Belmont Plaza Pool Rebuild-Revitalization* prepared by AESCO (April 24, 2014); and *Soil Corrosivity Evaluation for the Belmont Plaza Pool Facility Rebuild/Revitalization Project*, prepared by HDR Schiff (April 23, 2014), which together are referred to as the *Geotechnical Evaluations*. Design, grading, and construction shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of the City of Long Beach (City) Municipal Code (Title 18) and the California Building Code (CBC) applicable at the time of grading, appropriate local grading regulations, and the requirements of the Project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final written report, subject to review and approval by the Development Services Director, or designee, prior to commencement of grading activities.

Specific requirements in the Final Geotechnical Report shall address:

1. Seismic design considerations and requirements for structures and nonstructural components permanently attached to structures
2. Foundations including ground improvements (deep soil mixing and stone columns) and shallow foundation design
3. Earthwork, including site preparation for structural areas (building pad) and sidewalks, pavements, and other flatwork areas; fill material; temporary excavations; and trench backfill
4. Liquefaction
5. Site drainage
6. Slabs-on-grade and pavements
7. Retaining walls

Additional site testing and final design evaluation shall be conducted by the Project geotechnical consultant to refine and enhance these requirements, if necessary. The City shall require the Project

geotechnical consultant to assess whether the requirements in that report need to be modified or refined to address any changes in the Project features that occur prior to the start of grading. If the Project geotechnical consultant identifies modifications or refinements to the requirements, the City shall require appropriate changes to the final Project design and specifications.

Grading plan review shall also be conducted by the City's Development Services Director, or designee, prior to the start of grading to verify that the requirements developed during the geotechnical design evaluation have been appropriately incorporated into the Project plans. Design, grading, and construction shall be conducted in accordance with the specifications of the Project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final report based on the CBC applicable at the time of grading and building and the City Building Code. On-site inspection during grading shall be conducted by the Project geotechnical consultant and the City Building Official to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into Project plans.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. During construction of the proposed Project, there is a potential for disruption of the soils on the entire Project site. Construction activities could potentially result in erosion and loss of topsoil. However, all excavation, trenching, and compaction activities would be performed under the observation of a qualified engineer and the Project would be required to adhere to all applicable construction standards with regard to erosion control. Standard Condition 4.2.2 (Applicable Rules 403 and 402 Measures) and Mitigation Measure 4.8.1 (Construction General Permit) would be implemented to reduce potential significant impacts related to soil erosion. Therefore, with implementation of Standard Condition 4.2.2 and Mitigation Measure 4.8.1, impacts would be considered less than significant.

Standard Condition 4.2.2: **Applicable Rules 403 and 402 Measures.** The Project construction contractor shall develop and implement dust-control methods that shall achieve this control level in a SCAQMD Rule 403 dust control plan, designate personnel to monitor the dust control program, and order increased watering, as necessary, to ensure a 55 percent control level. Those duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. Additional control measures to reduce fugitive dust shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Apply water twice daily, or nontoxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces or as needed to areas where soil is disturbed.
- Use low-sulfur fuel for stationary construction equipment. This is required by SCAQMD Rules 431.1 and 431.2.

- During earthmoving or excavation operations, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust-preventive measures using the following procedures:
    - All material excavated shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering, with complete coverage, shall occur at least twice daily, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day.
    - All earthmoving or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e., winds greater than 20 miles per hour [mph] averaged over 1 hour).
    - All material transported off site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
    - The area disturbed by earthmoving or excavation operations shall be minimized at all times.
- After earthmoving or excavation operations, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled using the following measures:
    - Portions of the construction area to remain inactive longer than a period of 3 months shall be revegetated and watered until cover is grown.
    - All active portions of the construction site shall be watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- At all times, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled using the following procedures:
    - On-site vehicle speed shall be limited to 15 mph.
    - Road improvements shall be paved as soon as feasible, watered periodically, or chemically stabilized.
- At all times during the construction phase, ozone precursor emissions from mobile equipment shall be controlled using the following procedures:
    - Equipment engines shall be maintained in good condition and in proper tune according to manufacturers' specifications.
    - On-site mobile equipment shall not be left idling for a period longer than 60 seconds.
- Outdoor storage piles of construction materials shall be kept covered, watered, or otherwise chemically stabilized with a chemical wetting agent to minimize fugitive dust emissions and wind erosion.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.1: **Construction General Permit.** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Long Beach (City) shall obtain coverage for the proposed Project under the State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, Permit No. CAS000002), as

amended by Order Nos. 2010-0004-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ (Construction General Permit), or subsequent issuance. For projects with a disturbed area of 5 or more acres, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with construction Best Management Plans (BMPs) is required to be submitted to both the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the City.

The City shall provide the Waste Discharge Identification Numbers to the Development Services Director to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Construction General Permit. A SWPPP shall be prepared and implemented for the proposed Project in compliance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. The SWPPP shall identify construction BMPs to be implemented to ensure that the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation is minimized and to control the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff as a result of construction activities.

Finding: The standard conditions and mitigation measure are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to the loss of topsoil to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Result in a project that is located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project.

Landslides and Unstable Slopes. Although the Project site is relatively flat and landslides or other forms of natural slope instability do not represent a significant hazard to the proposed Project, grading activities during construction would produce temporary construction slopes in some areas. Mitigation Measure 4.5.1 requires that planned grading and shoring conform to the recommendations of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (2014), which contains specific recommendations for addressing potential slope instability during construction. With implementation of these recommendations in accordance with Mitigation Measure 4.5.1, potential impacts related to slope instability during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Lateral Spreading and Liquefaction. The Project site is located within a Liquefaction Hazard Zone and the Preliminary Geotechnical Report concluded that the proposed Project would experience a high liquefaction or lateral spreading potential due to its location, historical high groundwater levels, and the presence of soil conditions common to liquefaction areas. Compliance with applicable building codes and the incorporation of the design recommendations in the final geotechnical report into final design plans would reduce potential impacts related to liquefaction to a less than significant level. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.1, potential Project impacts related to liquefaction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The Geotechnical Evaluations determined that several feet of lateral spreading toward the Pacific Ocean could occur in the event of earthquake ground motions. However, the Geotechnical Evaluations concluded that the proposed Project is feasible with implementation of the final engineering design recommendations and compliance with the most current CBC. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.5.1 requiring compliance with the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Evaluations and the final geotechnical report would ensure that potential impacts related to lateral spreading are reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.5.1: **Conformance with the Project Geotechnical Studies.** All grading operations and construction shall be conducted in conformance with the recommendations included in the *Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for the Proposed Belmont Plaza Olympic Pool Revitalization Project,* prepared by MACTEC (April 14, 2009); the *Geotechnical Investigation for the Temporary Myrtha Pool and Associated Improvements, Belmont Plaza Revitalization,* prepared by GMU Geotechnical, Inc. (April 3, 2013); the *Preliminary Geotechnical Report for the Belmont Plaza Pool Rebuild-Revitalization* prepared by AESCO (April 24, 2014); and *Soil Corrosivity Evaluation for the Belmont Plaza Pool Facility Rebuild/Revitalization Project*, prepared by HDR Schiff (April 23, 2014), which together are referred to as the *Geotechnical Evaluations*. Design, grading, and construction shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of the City of Long Beach (City) Municipal Code (Title 18) and the California Building Code (CBC) applicable at the time of grading, appropriate local grading regulations, and the requirements of the Project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final written report, subject to review and approval by the Development Services Director, or designee, prior to commencement of grading activities.

Specific requirements in the Final Geotechnical Report shall address:

1. Seismic design considerations and requirements for structures and nonstructural components permanently attached to structures
2. Foundations including ground improvements (deep soil mixing and stone columns) and shallow foundation design
3. Earthwork, including site preparation for structural areas (building pad) and sidewalks, pavements, and other flatwork areas; fill material; temporary excavations; and trench backfill
4. Liquefaction
5. Site drainage
6. Slabs-on-grade and pavements
7. Retaining walls

Additional site testing and final design evaluation shall be conducted by the Project geotechnical consultant to refine and enhance these requirements, if necessary. The City shall require the Project geotechnical consultant to assess whether the requirements in that report need to be modified or refined to address any changes in the Project features that occur prior to the start of grading. If the Project geotechnical consultant identifies modifications or refinements to the requirements, the City shall require appropriate changes to the final Project design and specifications.

Grading plan review shall also be conducted by the City's Development Services Director, or designee, prior to the start of grading to verify that

the requirements developed during the geotechnical design evaluation have been appropriately incorporated into the Project plans. Design, grading, and construction shall be conducted in accordance with the specifications of the Project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final report based on the CBC applicable at the time of grading and building and the City Building Code. On-site inspection during grading shall be conducted by the Project geotechnical consultant and the City Building Official to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into Project plans.

Corrosive Soils. Corrosive soils could potentially create a significant hazard to the proposed Project by weakening the structural integrity of the concrete and metal used to construct the building and potentially lead to structural instability. Laboratory testing indicates that on-site soils could be severely corrosive to ferrous metals. Mitigation Measure 4.5.2 requires protection of ferrous metals and copper against corrosion. Corrosion protection may include, but is not limited to, sacrificial metal, the use of protective coatings, and/or cathodic protection. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.2, potential impacts related to corrosive soils would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.5.2: **Corrosive Soils.** Prior to issuance of any building permits, the City of Long Beach (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that structural design conforms to the requirements of the geotechnical study with regard to the protection of ferrous metals and copper that will come into contact with on-site soil. In addition, on-site inspections shall be conducted during construction by the Project geotechnical consultant and/or City Building Official to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into Project plans.

The measures specified in the geotechnical study for steel pipes, iron pipes, copper tubing, plastic and vitrified clay pipe, other pipes, concrete, post tensioning slabs, concrete piles, and steel piles shall be incorporated into the structural design and Project plans where ferrous metals (e.g., iron or steel) and/or copper may come into contact with on-site soils.

Finding: The mitigation measures are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to unstable geologic units or soil to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Result in a cumulative impact with respect to geology and soils. New development projects in the project area would also be required to meet similar engineering standards to reduce their own potential geologic impacts to a less than significant level. There are no other known activities or projects with activities that would affect the geology and soils at the Project site. Furthermore, there are no geotechnical conditions on site that would prohibit construction, and no activities associated with the Project that would contribute to any cumulative geological effects in the Project vicinity. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.1 ensures that the proposed Project complies with recommendations in the Geotechnical Evaluations, and Mitigation Measure 4.5.2 requires protection of ferrous metals and copper against corrosion; adherence to these measures would ensure that the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on Geology and Soils. Therefore, with implementation of the proposed mitigation, the proposed Project's geological impacts are considered less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure 4.5.1: **Conformance with the Project Geotechnical Studies.** All grading operations and construction shall be conducted in conformance with the recommendations included in the *Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for the Proposed Belmont Plaza Olympic Pool Revitalization Project,* prepared by MACTEC (April 14, 2009); the *Geotechnical Investigation for the Temporary Myrtha Pool and Associated Improvements, Belmont Plaza Revitalization,* prepared by GMU Geotechnical, Inc. (April 3, 2013); the *Preliminary Geotechnical Report for the Belmont Plaza Pool Rebuild-Revitalization* prepared by AESCO (April 24, 2014); and *Soil Corrosivity Evaluation for the Belmont Plaza Pool Facility Rebuild/Revitalization Project*, prepared by HDR Schiff (April 23, 2014), which together are referred to as the *Geotechnical Evaluations*. Design, grading, and construction shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of the City of Long Beach (City) Municipal Code (Title 18) and the California Building Code (CBC) applicable at the time of grading, appropriate local grading regulations, and the requirements of the Project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final written report, subject to review and approval by the Development Services Director, or designee, prior to commencement of grading activities.

Specific requirements in the Final Geotechnical Report shall address:

1. Seismic design considerations and requirements for structures and nonstructural components permanently attached to structures
2. Foundations including ground improvements (deep soil mixing and stone columns) and shallow foundation design
3. Earthwork, including site preparation for structural areas (building pad) and sidewalks, pavements, and other flatwork areas; fill material; temporary excavations; and trench backfill
4. Liquefaction
5. Site drainage
6. Slabs-on-grade and pavements
7. Retaining walls

Additional site testing and final design evaluation shall be conducted by the Project geotechnical consultant to refine and enhance these requirements, if necessary. The City shall require the Project geotechnical consultant to assess whether the requirements in that report need to be modified or refined to address any changes in the Project features that occur prior to the start of grading. If the Project geotechnical consultant identifies modifications or refinements to the requirements, the City shall require appropriate changes to the final Project design and specifications.

Grading plan review shall also be conducted by the City's Development Services Director, or designee, prior to the start of grading to verify that

the requirements developed during the geotechnical design evaluation have been appropriately incorporated into the Project plans. Design, grading, and construction shall be conducted in accordance with the specifications of the Project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final report based on the CBC applicable at the time of grading and building and the City Building Code. On-site inspection during grading shall be conducted by the Project geotechnical consultant and the City Building Official to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into Project plans.

Mitigation Measure 4.5.2: **Corrosive Soils.** Prior to issuance of any building permits, the City of Long Beach (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that structural design conforms to the requirements of the geotechnical study with regard to the protection of ferrous metals and copper that will come into contact with on-site soil. In addition, on-site inspections shall be conducted during construction by the Project geotechnical consultant and/or City Building Official to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into Project plans.

The measures specified in the geotechnical study for steel pipes, iron pipes, copper tubing, plastic and vitrified clay pipe, other pipes, concrete, post tensioning slabs, concrete piles, and steel piles shall be incorporated into the structural design and Project plans where ferrous metals (e.g., iron or steel) and/or copper may come into contact with on-site soils.

Finding: The mitigation measures are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant cumulative impacts related to geology and soils to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impacts: The following impacts are discussed together in the Draft EIR and the Final EIR; each bullet point represents a potential environmental impact that is discussed below.

- **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.**
- **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.**

Construction activities would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. All potentially hazardous materials would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with existing federal, State, and local regulations to ensure that the amounts of these materials present during construction would be limited and would not pose a significant adverse hazard to workers or the environment. Furthermore, the construction contractor would be required to implement standard BMPs regarding hazardous materials storage, handling, and disposal during construction in compliance with the State Construction General Permit to protect water quality (Mitigation Measure 4.8.1). Therefore, potential impacts associated with

the routine transport, use, or disposal of potentially hazardous materials during construction of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Based on the distance to known oil wells in the vicinity of the Project site, the potential presence of methane at the Project site is low. The low potential for encountering methane during excavation for the pool would be managed through compliance with a Contingency Plan (Mitigation Measure 4.7.1) that addresses the potential to encounter unknown hazards or hazardous substances during construction activities that would be approved by the LBFD. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7.1, impacts related to the potential to encounter methane during construction would be less than significant.

A site reconnaissance survey of the site revealed that asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) may be present in subsurface building materials at the site. While the majority of the buildings on the site were previously demolished under an emergency permit (Statutory Exemption SE14-01), several subsurface structures which may contain ACMs are currently present on the site. In addition to the potential to encounter ACMs in subsurface structures present on the site, the site reconnaissance survey indicated that the tile liners of the two outdoor pools to be demolished might contain lead. Mitigation Measure 4.7.2 requires the preparation of predemolition surveys to identify the presence of ACMs and lead in the existing on-site structures and outlines precautions to ensure the materials are properly removed. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation 4.7.2, potential hazardous impacts associated with ACMs and lead would be reduced to a less than significant level.

There is a potential to encounter dissolved metals levels in groundwater in excess of the allowable limits for discharge to the storm drain system. This will be addressed through compliance with the applicable NPDES permit or the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB's) Groundwater Discharge Permit, which would require testing and treatment (as necessary) of groundwater encountered during groundwater dewatering prior to release to the storm drain system. If dewatered groundwater cannot meet the discharge limitations specified in the Groundwater Discharge Permit, groundwater would be disposed of in the sewer system and would have to meet LACSD discharge limits prior to release to the storm drain system.

The potential that groundwater is impacted by petroleum hydrocarbons beneath the site is low. The low potential for encountering petroleum hydrocarbons in groundwater during excavation for the pool would be managed through compliance with a Contingency Plan that addresses the potential to encounter unknown hazards or hazardous substances during construction activities that would be approved by the LBFD. This Contingency Plan requirement is included as Mitigation Measure 4.7.1. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7.1, impacts related to the potential to encounter petroleum hydrocarbons in groundwater during construction would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed Project would not include uses with the potential to generate large quantities of hazardous and/or toxic materials, and would, therefore, have less than significant impacts related to the potential to cause fires or result in serious accidents from hazardous materials and substances. Pool and building maintenance associated with the proposed Project may include the use of chemicals that can be hazardous if not properly used, stored, or disposed. However, the use, storage, and handling of these pool maintenance hazardous materials is regulated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the CBC, the County of Los Angeles Department of Environmental Health, the LBFD, and the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA). Compliance with applicable regulations would ensure that potential hazardous material impacts associated with the operation of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.7.1: **Contingency Plan.** Prior to issuance of any excavation or grading permits or activities, the City of Long Beach (City) Fire Department (LBFD), or designee, shall review and approve a contingency plan that addresses the potential to encounter on-site unknown hazards or hazardous substances during construction activities. The plan shall require that if construction workers encounter underground tanks, gases, odors, uncontained spills, or other unidentified substances, the contractor shall stop work, cordon off the affected area, and notify the LBFD. The LBFD responder shall determine the next steps regarding possible site evacuation, sampling, and disposal of the substance consistent with local, State, and federal regulations.

Mitigation Measure 4.7.2: **Predemolition Surveys.** Prior to commencement of demolition and/or construction activities, the City LBFD, or designee, shall verify that predemolition surveys for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead (including sampling and analysis of all suspected building materials) shall be performed. All inspections, surveys, and analyses shall be performed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations (i.e., American Society for Testing and Materials E 1527-05, and 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Subchapter R, Toxic Substances Control Act [TSCA], Part 716). If the predemolition surveys do not find ACMs or lead-based pipes (LBPs), the inspectors shall provide documentation of the inspection and its results to the City LBFD, or designee, to confirm that no further abatement actions are required.

If the predemolition surveys find evidence of ACMs or lead, all such materials shall be removed, handled, and properly disposed of by appropriately licensed contractors according to all applicable regulations during demolition of structures (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 745, 761, and 763). Air monitoring shall be completed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations both to ensure adherence to applicable regulations (e.g., South Coast Air Quality Management District [SCAQMD]) and to provide safety to workers. The City shall provide documentation (e.g., all required waste manifests, sampling, and air monitoring analytical results) to the LBFD showing that abatement of any ACMs or lead identified in these structures has been completed in full compliance with all applicable regulations and approved by the appropriate regulatory agencies (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 716, 745, 761, 763, and 795 and California Code of Regulations Title 8, Article 2.6). An Operating and Maintenance Plan shall be prepared for any ACM or lead to remain in place and shall be reviewed and approved by the LBFD.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.1: **Construction General Permit.** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Long Beach (City) shall obtain coverage for the proposed Project under the State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, Permit No. CAS000002), as

amended by Order Nos. 2010-0004-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ (Construction General Permit), or subsequent issuance. For projects with a disturbed area of 5 or more acres, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with construction Best Management Plans (BMPs) is required to be submitted to both the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the City.

The City shall provide the Waste Discharge Identification Numbers to the Development Services Director to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Construction General Permit. A SWPPP shall be prepared and implemented for the proposed Project in compliance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. The SWPPP shall identify construction BMPs to be implemented to ensure that the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation is minimized and to control the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff as a result of construction activities.

Finding: The mitigation measures are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials (routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials) to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Construction activities would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. All potentially hazardous materials would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with existing federal, State, and local regulations to ensure that the amounts of these materials present during construction would be limited and would not pose a significant adverse hazard to workers or the environment. Furthermore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.1, as well as Mitigation Measure 4.7.2, any associated risk would be adequately reduced to a level that is less than significant through compliance with these mitigation measures and applicable standards and regulations. Therefore, the limited use and storage of hazardous materials during construction of the proposed Project would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment, including the Belmont Shore Children's Center.

Operation of the proposed Project would not include uses with the potential to generate large quantities of hazardous and/or toxic materials and, therefore, the potential to cause fires or result in serious accidents from hazardous materials and substances during operations is less than significant. The proposed Project would not produce any significant amounts of hazardous emissions; any hazardous materials on site would be handled in accordance with all applicable regulations, including containment, reporting, and remediation requirements, in the event of a spill or accidental release. Therefore, operation of the proposed Project would not result in a significant impact associated with hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school, and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.1: **Construction General Permit.** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Long Beach (City) shall obtain coverage for the proposed Project under the State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Storm Water

Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, Permit No. CAS000002), as amended by Order Nos. 2010-0004-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ (Construction General Permit), or subsequent issuance. For projects with a disturbed area of 5 or more acres, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with construction Best Management Plans (BMPs) is required to be submitted to both the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the City.

The City shall provide the Waste Discharge Identification Numbers to the Development Services Director to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Construction General Permit. A SWPPP shall be prepared and implemented for the proposed Project in compliance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. The SWPPP shall identify construction BMPs to be implemented to ensure that the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation is minimized and to control the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff as a result of construction activities.

Mitigation Measure 4.7.2: **Predemolition Surveys.** Prior to commencement of demolition and/or construction activities, the City LBFD, or designee, shall verify that predemolition surveys for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead (including sampling and analysis of all suspected building materials) shall be performed. All inspections, surveys, and analyses shall be performed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations (i.e., American Society for Testing and Materials E 1527-05, and 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Subchapter R, Toxic Substances Control Act [TSCA], Part 716). If the predemolition surveys do not find ACMs or lead-based pipes (LBPs), the inspectors shall provide documentation of the inspection and its results to the City LBFD, or designee, to confirm that no further abatement actions are required.

If the predemolition surveys find evidence of ACMs or lead, all such materials shall be removed, handled, and properly disposed of by appropriately licensed contractors according to all applicable regulations during demolition of structures (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 745, 761, and 763). Air monitoring shall be completed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations both to ensure adherence to applicable regulations (e.g., South Coast Air Quality Management District [SCAQMD]) and to provide safety to workers. The City shall provide documentation (e.g., all required waste manifests, sampling, and air monitoring analytical results) to the LBFD showing that abatement of any ACMs or lead identified in these structures has been completed in full compliance with all applicable regulations and approved by the appropriate regulatory agencies (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 716, 745, 761, 763, and 795 and California Code of Regulations Title 8, Article 2.6). An Operating and Maintenance Plan shall be prepared for any ACM or lead to remain in place and shall be reviewed and approved by the LBFD.

Finding: The mitigation measures are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to hazardous materials, substances, and waste emitted within 0.25 mile of a school to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant hazards and hazardous materials impact. There are no known projects adjacent to or in the vicinity of the Project site that could be affected by on-site handling of hazardous materials or that could result in significant hazards or hazardous materials impacts on site. The contribution of hazardous materials use and hazardous waste disposal with implementation of the proposed Project is minimal, and combined hazardous materials effects from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within the City would not be significant.

Impacts associated with removal of unknown hazardous materials during Project construction and use of hazardous materials on site would be controlled through application of the procedures set forth in Mitigation Measures 4.7.1 and 4.7.2. Accordingly, the proposed Project's contribution to hazardous materials impacts would be less than cumulatively significant with implementation of mitigation.

Mitigation Measure 4.7.1: **Contingency Plan.** Prior to issuance of any excavation or grading permits or activities, the City of Long Beach (City) Fire Department (LBFD), or designee, shall review and approve a contingency plan that addresses the potential to encounter on-site unknown hazards or hazardous substances during construction activities. The plan shall require that if construction workers encounter underground tanks, gases, odors, uncontained spills, or other unidentified substances, the contractor shall stop work, cordon off the affected area, and notify the LBFD. The LBFD responder shall determine the next steps regarding possible site evacuation, sampling, and disposal of the substance consistent with local, State, and federal regulations.

Mitigation Measure 4.7.2: **Predemolition Surveys.** Prior to commencement of demolition and/or construction activities, the City LBFD, or designee, shall verify that predemolition surveys for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead (including sampling and analysis of all suspected building materials) shall be performed. All inspections, surveys, and analyses shall be performed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations (i.e., American Society for Testing and Materials E 1527-05, and 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Subchapter R, Toxic Substances Control Act [TSCA], Part 716). If the predemolition surveys do not find ACMs or lead-based pipes (LBPs), the inspectors shall provide documentation of the inspection and its results to the City LBFD, or designee, to confirm that no further abatement actions are required.

If the predemolition surveys find evidence of ACMs or lead, all such materials shall be removed, handled, and properly disposed of by appropriately licensed contractors according to all applicable regulations during demolition of structures (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 745, 761, and 763). Air monitoring shall be completed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable

regulations both to ensure adherence to applicable regulations (e.g., South Coast Air Quality Management District [SCAQMD]) and to provide safety to workers. The City shall provide documentation (e.g., all required waste manifests, sampling, and air monitoring analytical results) to the LBFD showing that abatement of any ACMs or lead identified in these structures has been completed in full compliance with all applicable regulations and approved by the appropriate regulatory agencies (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 716, 745, 761, 763, and 795 and California Code of Regulations Title 8, Article 2.6). An Operating and Maintenance Plan shall be prepared for any ACM or lead to remain in place and shall be reviewed and approved by the LBFD.

Finding: The mitigation measures are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to the proposed Project's contribution to a potentially significant hazards and hazardous materials impact to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Impacts: The following impacts are discussed together in the Draft EIR and the Final EIR; each bullet point represents a potential environmental impact that is discussed below.

- **Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.**
- **Otherwise substantially degrade water quality.**

Pollutants of concern during construction include sediments, trash, petroleum products, concrete waste, sanitary waste, and chemicals. The Project site would be graded and/or excavated, resulting in exposed soil which would result in an increased potential for soil erosion compared to existing conditions. In addition, chemicals, liquid products, petroleum products and concrete-related waste may be spilled or leaked and have the potential to be transported via storm runoff into downstream receiving waters (i.e., the beach and, ultimately, the Pacific Ocean). Furthermore, due to the anticipated depth of excavation and the depth of groundwater, groundwater is anticipated to be encountered during excavation, which would require groundwater dewatering. Groundwater may contain high levels of total dissolved solids and other constituents that could be introduced to surface waters. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.8.1 and 4.8.2, which require compliance with the General Construction Permit and the Groundwater Discharge Permit, including implementation of BMPs to target pollutants of concern, would reduce potential construction impacts related to violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and degradation of water quality to less than significant levels.

Pollutants of concern during operation of the proposed on-site uses could potentially include pathogens, metals, nutrients, pesticides, organic compounds, sediment, trash and debris, oxygen-demanding substances, and oil and grease. The proposed Project would result in a permanent decrease in impervious surface area of approximately 0.5 acre and an increase in pervious area of approximately 0.5 acre. A decrease in impervious area would decrease the volume of runoff during a storm. As specified in Mitigation Measure 4.8.3, a SUSMP would be developed for the proposed Project, which would include the BMPs that would be consistent with the requirements of the City of Long Beach Low Impact Development (LID) BMP Design Manual and would target pollutants of concern from the Project site. In addition, the SUSMP would include an operations and maintenance plan for the bioswales, drywell, filtration strip, and an underground detention basin to ensure their long-term performance. Implementation of BMPs that target pollutants of concern in runoff from the Project site, as required by

Mitigation Measure 4.8.3, would reduce potential operational impacts related to violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and degradation of water quality to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.1: **Construction General Permit.** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Long Beach (City) shall obtain coverage for the proposed Project under the State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, Permit No. CAS000002), as amended by Order Nos. 2010-0004-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ (Construction General Permit), or subsequent issuance. For projects with a disturbed area of 5 or more acres, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with construction Best Management Plans (BMPs) is required to be submitted to both the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the City.

The City shall provide the Waste Discharge Identification Numbers to the Development Services Director to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Construction General Permit. A SWPPP shall be prepared and implemented for the proposed Project in compliance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. The SWPPP shall identify construction BMPs to be implemented to ensure that the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation is minimized and to control the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff as a result of construction activities.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.2: **Dewatering During Construction Activities.** During project construction, the City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee, shall ensure that any dewatering activities during construction shall comply with the requirements of the Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (Order No. R4-2013-0095, Permit No. CAG994004) (Groundwater Discharge Permit) or subsequent permit. This Groundwater Discharge Permit shall include submission of a Notice of Intent (NOI) for coverage under the permit to the Los Angeles RWQCB at least 45 days prior to the start of dewatering and compliance with all applicable provisions in the permit, including water sampling, analysis, and reporting of dewatering-related discharges. If dewatered groundwater cannot meet the discharge limitations specified in the Groundwater Discharge Permit, a permit shall be obtained from the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) to discharge groundwater to the sewer per LACSD's Wastewater Ordinance.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.3: **Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City shall submit a Final Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) for the proposed Project to the Development Services Director for review and approval. Project-specific site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Control BMPs contained in the Final SUSMP shall be incorporated into final design. The BMPs shall

be consistent with the requirements of the *Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) Design Manual*. Additionally, the BMPS shall be designed and maintained to target pollutants of concern and reduce runoff from the Project site. The SUSMP shall include an operations and maintenance plan for the prescribed Treatment Control BMPs to ensure their long-term performance.

Finding: The mitigation measures are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality (water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, and degradation of water quality) to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impacts: The following impacts are discussed together in the Draft EIR and the Final EIR; each bullet point represents a potential environmental impact that is discussed below.

- **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.**
- **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.**

There are no on-site streams or rivers. Therefore, the proposed Project would not alter the course of a stream or river.

During construction, there is the potential for the drainage pattern on the Project site to be altered temporarily. During a storm event, soil erosion and sedimentation could occur at an accelerated rate. In addition, grading and construction activities would compact soil, which can increase runoff during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.1, which requires compliance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit and implementation of BMPs during construction, would reduce potential construction impacts related to erosion, siltation, and flooding to less than significant levels.

The proposed Project would decrease the overall impervious area by 0.5 acre and increase the pervious area by 0.5 acre, resulting in an increase in on-site percolation. The proposed Project would also include a comprehensive drainage system to convey on-site storm flows, including on-site detention and infiltration BMPs. In the proposed condition, the impervious surface areas would not be prone to erosion or siltation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.3, which requires the implementation of Treatment BMPs to control runoff, and Mitigation Measure 4.8.4, which requires the development of a hydrology report to ensure flows would not exceed the capacity of existing storm drain facilities, the proposed Project would not contribute to an increase in downstream erosion, siltation, or flooding.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.1: **Construction General Permit.** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Long Beach (City) shall obtain coverage for the proposed Project under the State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, Permit No. CAS000002), as amended by Order Nos. 2010-0004-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ

(Construction General Permit), or subsequent issuance. For projects with a disturbed area of 5 or more acres, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with construction Best Management Plans (BMPs) is required to be submitted to both the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the City.

The City shall provide the Waste Discharge Identification Numbers to the Development Services Director to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Construction General Permit. A SWPPP shall be prepared and implemented for the proposed Project in compliance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. The SWPPP shall identify construction BMPs to be implemented to ensure that the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation is minimized and to control the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff as a result of construction activities.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.3: **Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City shall submit a Final Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) for the proposed Project to the Development Services Director for review and approval. Project-specific site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Control BMPs contained in the Final SUSMP shall be incorporated into final design. The BMPs shall be consistent with the requirements of the *Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) Design Manual.* Additionally, the BMPS shall be designed and maintained to target pollutants of concern and reduce runoff from the Project site. The SUSMP shall include an operations and maintenance plan for the prescribed Treatment Control BMPs to ensure their long-term performance.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.4: **Hydrology Reports.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City shall submit a final hydrology report for the proposed Project to the City Development Services Director, or designee, for review and approval. The hydrology report shall demonstrate, based on hydrologic calculations, that the proposed Project's on-site storm conveyance and detention and infiltration facilities are designed in accordance with the requirement of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Hydrology Manual.

Finding: The mitigation measures are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality (off-site or downstream flooding, erosion, or siltation) to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Create or contribute to runoff water that would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system.

The proposed Project has the potential to introduce pollutants into the storm water drainage system through erosion, siltation, and accidental spills. Furthermore, due to the depth of groundwater (i.e., 6 to 9 ft below existing grades) and the anticipated depth of excavation (up to 13 ft below existing grade), groundwater dewatering is anticipated to be required during the removal of the remaining wooden piles

and construction of the pools. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.8.1 and 4.8.2, which require compliance with the General Construction Permit and the Groundwater Discharge Permit, construction impacts related to exceeding the capacity of, and providing additional sources of polluted runoff to, storm water drainage systems would be reduced to less than significant levels.

The proposed Project would decrease impervious surface area by 0.5 acre and increase the pervious area by approximately 0.5 acre, which would decrease the volume and velocity of runoff on the site. The proposed Project would also include a comprehensive drainage system to convey on-site storm flows. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.3, which requires the implementation of Treatment BMPs to control runoff, and Mitigation Measure 4.8.4, which requires the development of a hydrology report to ensure flows would not exceed the capacity of existing storm drain facilities, operational impacts related to exceedance of the capacity of, and providing additional sources of polluted runoff to, storm water drainage systems would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.1: **Construction General Permit.** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Long Beach (City) shall obtain coverage for the proposed Project under the State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, Permit No. CAS000002), as amended by Order Nos. 2010-0004-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ (Construction General Permit), or subsequent issuance. For projects with a disturbed area of 5 or more acres, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with construction Best Management Plans (BMPs) is required to be submitted to both the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the City.

The City shall provide the Waste Discharge Identification Numbers to the Development Services Director to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Construction General Permit. A SWPPP shall be prepared and implemented for the proposed Project in compliance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. The SWPPP shall identify construction BMPs to be implemented to ensure that the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation is minimized and to control the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff as a result of construction activities.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.2: **Dewatering During Construction Activities.** During project construction, the City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee, shall ensure that any dewatering activities during construction shall comply with the requirements of the Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (Order No. R4-2013-0095, Permit No. CAG994004) (Groundwater Discharge Permit) or subsequent permit. This Groundwater Discharge Permit shall include submission of a Notice of Intent (NOI) for coverage under the permit to the Los Angeles RWQCB at least 45 days prior to the start of dewatering and compliance with all applicable provisions in the permit, including water sampling, analysis, and reporting of dewatering-related discharges. If dewatered

groundwater cannot meet the discharge limitations specified in the Groundwater Discharge Permit, a permit shall be obtained from the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) to discharge groundwater to the sewer per LACSD's Wastewater Ordinance.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.3: **Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City shall submit a Final Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) for the proposed Project to the Development Services Director for review and approval. Project-specific site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Control BMPs contained in the Final SUSMP shall be incorporated into final design. The BMPs shall be consistent with the requirements of the *Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) Design Manual*. Additionally, the BMPS shall be designed and maintained to target pollutants of concern and reduce runoff from the Project site. The SUSMP shall include an operations and maintenance plan for the prescribed Treatment Control BMPs to ensure their long-term performance.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.4: **Hydrology Reports.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City shall submit a final hydrology report for the proposed Project to the City Development Services Director, or designee, for review and approval. The hydrology report shall demonstrate, based on hydrologic calculations, that the proposed Project's on-site storm conveyance and detention and infiltration facilities are designed in accordance with the requirement of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Hydrology Manual.

Finding: The mitigation measures are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality (exceed capacity of existing or planned storm drain system) to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.

The eastern half of the Project site is located within Zone A, a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) subject to inundation by the 1-percent annual chance of flood, and the western half of the Project site is located within Zone X, areas determined to be outside the 0.2-percent chance (500-year) floodplain. The City is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), which allows City property owners to obtain federally backed flood insurance. FEMA requires that all projects within Zone A enforce NFIP floodplain management regulations and purchase mandatory flood insurance. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.5 would require a floodplain report to be prepared in order to reduce impacts related to flood hazards. Compliance with City and FEMA regulations and implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.5 would ensure that the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to the risk of flooding, create floodplains, or result in an increase in the base flood elevation. Therefore, impacts associated with flood hazard areas would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.5: **Floodplain Report.** During final design, the Project engineer shall prepare and submit a floodplain/hydrology report to the City Development Services Director, or designee, to address any potential impacts to the floodplain and, if required, reduce those impacts. The report shall comply with City and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations and shall not increase the base flood elevation by more than 1 foot. Detailed analysis shall be conducted to ensure that the Project design specifically addresses floodplain issues so that the proposed Project complies with local and FEMA regulations on floodplains.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality (placement of structures within a 100-year flood zone which would impede or redirect flood flows) to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Noise

Impact: Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by the City of Long Beach.

Crowd, Spectator, and Public Address System Noise. Noise levels generated from the outdoor pool during special events would have the potential to impact nearby noise-sensitive uses because these events would involve a substantial number of spectators, whistles from officiating water polo games, starting horns, and the use of a public address sound system.

Exterior Noise. Spectator noise levels from the temporary outdoor seating would not exceed any of the City's daytime exterior noise levels at the Belmont Shores Children's Center or the closest residences; therefore, no violation of the City's daytime noise standards would occur. However, the playground associated with the Belmont Shores Children's Center, outdoor living areas associated with residences to the northeast (across from Ocean Boulevard), and residences to the northwest (across from Termino Avenue) may be subject to exterior noise levels from speaker noise and combined noise levels from the crowd and speaker noise. Speaker noise levels would potentially exceed the City's daytime exterior standard at the playground of the Belmont Shores Children's Center, and at the two residential locations. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10.1, which requires measures to reduce noise levels from the speakers, would reduce the combined noise level to below the City's exterior noise standards. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant after mitigation.

Mitigation Measure 4.10.1: Prior to issuance of the occupancy permit, the City of Long Beach's (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that a sound engineer has designed the permanent and temporary sound systems such that the City's exterior noise standards (daytime exterior noise level of 50 dBA L_{50}) are not exceeded at the surrounding sensitive land uses. Measures capable of reducing the noise levels include, but are not limited to:

- Reducing the source levels;
- Reducing the speaker elevations;

- Directing the speakers away from adjacent noise-sensitive land uses; and
- Using highly directional speakers.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to noise (complying with City noise standards) to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. The closest existing sensitive receptors would be subject to short-term construction noise levels that would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the Project area but would no longer occur once construction of the proposed Project is completed. In addition, noise generated from construction activities would be intermittent and temporary. Section 8.80.202 of the City's Municipal Code allows elevated construction-related noise levels as long as the construction activities are limited to the hours specified. Adherence to the City's noise regulations and implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.10.2 and 4.10.3, which require standard conditions for construction and conducting a preconstruction community meeting, would reduce construction noise impacts to sensitive receptors. Therefore, temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the proposed Project vicinity associated with Project construction would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.10.2: Prior to issuance of demolition or grading permits, the City of Long Beach's (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that construction and grading plans include the following conditions to reduce potential construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors:

- During all site excavation and grading, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards;
- The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the Project site;
- The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging to create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the Project site during all Project construction;
- The construction contractor shall ensure that engine idling from construction equipment (i.e., bulldozers and haul trucks) is limited to a maximum of 5 minutes at any given time; and
- The construction contractor shall ensure that all construction activities are scheduled to avoid operating several pieces of heavy equipment simultaneously.
- Construction, drilling, repair, remodeling, alteration, or demolition work shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday. In

accordance with City standards, no construction activities are permitted outside of these hours.

Mitigation Measure 4.10.3: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Long Beach Tidelands Capital Improvement Division shall hold a community preconstruction meeting in concert with the construction contractor to provide information to the public regarding the construction schedule. The construction schedule information shall include the duration of each construction activity and the specific location, days, frequency, and duration of the pile driving that will occur during each phase of the Project construction. Public notification of this meeting shall be undertaken in the same manner as the Notice of Availability mailings for this Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Finding: The mitigation measures are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to noise (temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels) to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Recreation

Impact: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Although the proposed Project would enhance the City's existing recreational facilities and open space uses, the proposed Project could potentially result in significant impacts related to interference with the public's ability to access open space and recreational areas adjacent to the Project site. Specifically, access to the Belmont Veteran's Memorial Pier, parking lots, beach areas, and the pedestrian/bicycle path may be subject to disruption during construction of the proposed Project, Mitigation Measure 4.12.2 (see Section 4.12, Traffic and Circulation, of this Draft EIR) requires that a Construction Traffic Management Plan be implemented to ensure that construction activities do not prevent access to the Belmont Veteran's Memorial Pier, beach access, and nearby pedestrian/bicycle path facilities in the Project vicinity. With implementation of the Construction Traffic Management Plan, construction activities are expected to have less than significant impacts on access to the surrounding off-site recreational facilities. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.12.2, short-term construction-related impacts on recreational resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.12.2: **Construction Traffic Management Plan.** Prior to the issuance of any demolition permits, the City of Long Beach (City) Parks and Recreation Director, or designee, shall develop a Construction Traffic Management Plan for review and approval by the City Traffic Engineer. The plan shall be designed by a registered Traffic Engineer and shall address traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation and public transit routes and shall ensure that emergency vehicle access is maintained. The plan shall identify the routes that construction vehicles shall use to access the site, the hours of construction traffic, traffic controls and detours, and off-site staging areas. The plan shall also require that a minimum of one travel lane in each direction on Ocean Boulevard be kept open during construction activities. Access to Belmont Veterans' Memorial Pier, the Shoreline Beach Bike Path, and the beach shall be maintained at all times. The

Construction Traffic Management Plan shall also require that access to the pier, the bike path, and the beach be kept open during construction activities. The plan shall also require the City to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to recreation to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Traffic and Circulation

Impact: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

The proposed Project would not result in a significant impact related to construction traffic with implementation of mitigation measures and all study area intersections are also anticipated to operate at Level-of-Service (LOS) C or better in the future with new traffic generated as a result of the proposed Project. However, in the event that a large special event (i.e., any event with more than 450 spectators) is held at Belmont Pool, an Event Traffic Management Plan would need to be developed that addresses potential impacts to traffic circulation and the steps necessary to avoid potential significant traffic congestion and parking impacts. Mitigation Measure 4.12.1 requires the City to prepare and implement an Event Traffic Management Plan that requires traffic and control measures for special events to be reviewed and approved by the City Traffic Engineer. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.12.1 would reduce event-related traffic impacts to the surrounding residences and businesses to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.12.1: **Event Traffic Management Plan.** In the event that a large special event (defined as more than 450 spectators) is held at Belmont Pool, the City of Long Beach (City) Parks and Recreation Director, or designee, shall develop an Event Traffic Management Plan for review and approval by the City Traffic Engineer. The plan shall be designed by a registered Traffic Engineer and shall address potential impacts to traffic circulation and the steps necessary to minimize potential impacts (e.g., active traffic management and/or off-site parking and shuttles) during the large special event.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Result in inadequate emergency access.

While the proposed Project would be designed to allow for emergency access to/from the site, potential temporary lane closures during Project construction could restrict access for emergency vehicles. Mitigation Measure 4.12.2 requires that a Construction Traffic Management Plan be prepared for the proposed Project, which would ensure that emergency vehicles would be able to navigate through streets adjacent to the Project site that may experience congestion due to construction activities. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.12.2, potential impacts related to emergency access during construction would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.12.2: **Construction Traffic Management Plan.** Prior to the issuance of any demolition permits, the City Parks and Recreation Director, or designee, shall develop a Construction Traffic Management Plan for review and approval by the City Traffic Engineer. The plan shall be designed by a registered Traffic Engineer and shall address traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation and public transit routes and shall ensure that emergency vehicle access is maintained. The plan shall identify the routes that construction vehicles shall use to access the site, the hours of construction traffic, traffic controls and detours, and off-site staging areas. The plan shall also require that a minimum of one travel lane in each direction on Ocean Boulevard be kept open during construction activities. Access to Belmont Veterans' Memorial Pier, the Shoreline Beach Bike Path, and the beach shall be maintained at all times. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall also require that access to the pier, the bike path, and the beach be kept open during construction activities. The plan shall also require the City to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to emergency access to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Utilities

Impact: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Wastewater from the Project site would be treated at the LACSD Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP). Due to the depth to groundwater (between 6 and 9 ft below ground surface) and the anticipated depth of excavation (up to 13 ft below existing grade), there is a potential for the groundwater table to be encountered during excavation, which may require groundwater dewatering. As specified in Mitigation Measure 4.8.2, any groundwater dewatering during excavation would be conducted in accordance with the Los Angeles RWQCB's Groundwater Discharge Permit, which would require testing and treatment (as necessary) of groundwater encountered during groundwater dewatering prior to release to a storm drain. If groundwater used during construction of the proposed Project cannot meet discharge limitations specified in the Ground Water Discharge Permit, a permit would be obtained from LACSD to dispose of the groundwater in the sewer system. The groundwater would have to meet LACSD discharge limitations prior to discharge to the sewer system. In addition, LACSD would ensure they have adequate capacity to accommodate the discharged groundwater prior to issuing a permit. Therefore, since the capacity and discharge limitations of the treatment facility that serve the proposed Project would not be exceeded, impacts regarding the ability of the treatment facility to treat and dispose of wastewater would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.2: **Dewatering During Construction Activities.** During project construction, the City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee, shall ensure that any dewatering activities during construction shall comply with the requirements of the Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and

Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (Order No. R4-2013-0095, Permit No. CAG994004) (Groundwater Discharge Permit) or subsequent permit. This Groundwater Discharge Permit shall include submission of a Notice of Intent (NOI) for coverage under the permit to the Los Angeles RWQCB at least 45 days prior to the start of dewatering and compliance with all applicable provisions in the permit, including water sampling, analysis, and reporting of dewatering-related discharges. If dewatered groundwater cannot meet the discharge limitations specified in the Groundwater Discharge Permit, a permit shall be obtained from the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) to discharge groundwater to the sewer per LACSD's Wastewater Ordinance.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to the exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

The proposed Project would result in a permanent decrease in impervious surface area which would decrease the volume of runoff during a storm. The proposed Project would also include a comprehensive drainage system to convey on-site storm flows, including on-site detention and infiltration systems. A detailed hydrology report would be prepared for the proposed Project to ensure that the on-site storm drain facilities are designed in accordance with the requirement of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Hydrology Manual to ensure that the runoff from the Project site does not exceed existing conditions (Mitigation Measure 4.8.4). With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.4, runoff from the Project site would not exceed the capacity of the existing storm water drainage system and the proposed Project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, impacts related to new or expanded storm water facilities would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.4.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.4: **Hydrology Reports.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City shall submit a final hydrology report for the proposed Project to the City Development Services Director, or designee, for review and approval. The hydrology report shall demonstrate, based on hydrologic calculations, that the proposed Project's on-site storm conveyance and detention and infiltration facilities are designed in accordance with the requirement of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Hydrology Manual.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects.

The proposed project will include treatment BMPs, such as biofiltration swales (bioswales), a filtration strip, an underground detention basin, and a drywell. As specified in Mitigation Measure 4.8.3, an SUSMP would be prepared for the proposed Project. The SUSMP would include an operations and maintenance plan for the bioswales, drywell, filtration strip, and an underground detention basin to ensure their long-term performance and prevent odor and vector issues from developing. Because the BMPs would be designed, inspected, and maintained as specified in Mitigation Measure 4.8.3 to prevent vectors and odors, impacts related to operation of storm water BMPs would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.8.3: **Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City shall submit a Final Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) for the proposed Project to the Development Services Director for review and approval. Project-specific site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Control BMPs contained in the Final SUSMP shall be incorporated into final design. The BMPs shall be consistent with the requirements of the Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) Design Manual. Additionally, the BMPS shall be designed and maintained to target pollutants of concern and reduce runoff from the Project site. The SUSMP shall include an operations and maintenance plan for the prescribed Treatment Control BMPs to ensure their long-term performance.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to the inclusion of storm water treatment control BMPs to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

D. SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

The proposed Project would not result in significant environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.

III. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

CEQA requires that an EIR describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Project or to its location that could feasibly attain most of the basic Project objectives, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects, and that it evaluate the comparative merits of each of the alternatives. Section 15126.6(b) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* states that the ". . . discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the proposed Project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the Project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the Project objectives, or would be more costly." The following section discusses the Project alternatives that were considered and analyzed in the EIR and summarizes the consistency of these alternatives with the objectives of the proposed Project.

The Final EIR identified five alternatives as follows:

- Alternative 1: No Project/No Development

- Alternative 2: Maintain Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses
- Alternative 3: Outdoor Diving Well
- Alternative 4: Reduced Project – No Outdoor Components
- Alternative 5: Reduced Project – No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components

The City's findings and facts in support of findings with respect to each of the alternatives considered are provided below. In making these findings, the City certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on alternatives provided in the Final EIR, including the information provided in comments on the Draft EIR and the responses to those comments in the Final EIR. The Final EIR's discussion and analysis of these alternatives considered in the Final EIR is not repeated in total in these findings, but the discussion and analysis of the alternatives in the Final EIR are incorporated in these findings by reference to supplement the analysis here. The City also certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered all other information in the administrative record.

No Project/No Development Alternative

Description: This alternative, which is required by CEQA, assumes that the Project site would remain in the same condition as it was at the time the NOP was published (April 2014). The setting of the site, at the time the NOP was published, is described throughout Chapter 4.0 of the EIR with respect to individual environmental issues, and forms the baseline of the impact assessment of the proposed Project.

This alternative would involve no changes to the existing land uses and conditions on the Project site. No new development on the Project site would occur. The temporary pool located in the parking area would continue to operate but no new pool facilities or open space would be constructed. The existing backfilled sand area where the previous building was located would remain unchanged.

Environmental Effects: The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that the on-site conditions, including the backfilled sand area where the former building stood, the existing open space areas, and the temporary pool would remain unchanged except for reasonably foreseeable pool and park maintenance activities. All required permits and standard conditions related to demolition were addressed in the emergency permit processed as a separate project. As this alternative would not include the construction or operation of a new pool facility, it would eliminate all construction activities and any increase in operations, resulting in reduced environmental impacts when compared to the proposed Project.

Existing views of and from the site and the visual character of the area would not be altered. No new air pollutant emissions or GHG emissions would be generated by new visitors, and no short-term construction emissions would occur since no new construction is proposed. The existing vegetation and wildlife on site would not be disturbed compared with existing conditions. Unknown potential subsurface archaeological and paleontological resources would remain undisturbed. There would be no impacts related to geology, soils, or hazardous materials. No short-term construction noise impacts or new long-term operational noise impacts would occur to the surrounding area. The No Project/No Development Alternative would enhance views in comparison to the proposed Project because the site where the former Belmont Pool facility stood would remain vacant and no new structures would be constructed. No additional requirements for fire or police services would occur. No additional vehicle trips would be generated by the site, no new sources of solid waste would be created by this alternative, and no increase in demand for energy would occur as a result of development.

However, under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the temporary pool would remain in place and would continue to degrade until it reaches the end of its operational lifespan, increasing the maintenance costs associated with operation of the facilities. There would be no change to the proposed Project site with regard to the percentage of the site that would remain pervious or the volume of runoff during a storm event, and runoff treatment from BMPs that are included in the proposed Project would not be implemented, resulting in incrementally greater hydrology/water quality impacts as compared to the proposed Project. In addition, the land use goals of the PD-2 designation (regulations specific to the use of the site for the Belmont Pool and Pier) would not be implemented and, therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be in conflict with the City's land use plans for the site and have greater land use impacts as compared to the proposed Project. The foreseeable impacts of the No Project/No Development Alternative include the permanent loss of parking where the temporary pool is located, and the inadequacy of the temporary facilities to replace the former aquatic facilities and serve the community/public recreational needs. Therefore, the No Project alternative would have greater impacts to Recreation than the proposed Project.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: The No Project/No Development Alternative achieves two of the Project Objectives; this alternative would minimize view disruptions and maintain the amount of open space compared to the former Belmont Pool facility because no new structures would be constructed on the site. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not develop the site with a revitalized Belmont Pool facility that better meets the needs of the aquatics community. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not achieve or further a majority of the Project Objectives.

Findings: On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve the Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project. In light of these considerations, the No Project/No Development Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed Project and is considered to be undesirable.

Facts in Support of the Finding: Because this alternative would not provide the new outdoor pool components associated with the proposed Project, it would reduce potentially significant noise impacts. However, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not satisfy a majority of the Project objectives nor would it realize the Project benefits of providing a revitalized modern facility that better meets the needs of the aquatics community. Furthermore, under this alternative, the City would not be able to operate a pool facility that would generate revenue to help offset the ongoing operation and maintenance costs of the facility. On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve any of the Project Objectives. In light of these considerations, this alternative has been rejected in favor of the proposed Project.

Maintain Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses

Description: This alternative would include the conversion of the temporary pool (approximately 13,450 sf) into a permanent aquatic facility, and would retain the existing two outdoor pools (4,400 sf). The Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative would include the construction of a permanent foundation for the pool along with construction of new administrative and support facilities (lockers, restrooms, snack bar). The site plan for this alternative would be consistent with the temporary pool configuration, with administrative and support facilities placed adjacent to the pool. The existing backfilled sand area would be removed and the park area would be expanded.

Environmental Effects: The Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative would eliminate the indoor pool facility component and reduce the total pool surface area by approximately 49 percent. The

reduced project footprint would result in an increase in open space. Although the indoor pool component would be eliminated with the Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative, impacts related to cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, and noise (operations) would be similar to the proposed Project for this alternative.

Construction-related biological resources, hydrology and water quality, air quality, global climate change, noise, and traffic impacts would be fewer than those under the proposed Project because construction activities would be reduced.

Operational-related impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, global climate change, hydrology and water quality, noise, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project. These impacts were determined to be less than significant for the proposed Project, and would remain less than significant for this alternative.

Compared to the proposed Project, land use and recreational impacts are greater for the Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative due to the permanent loss of public beach parking and the reduction in available recreational opportunities and programmable water area as compared to the proposed Project. A variance could be required if the replacement parking cannot be relocated as provided in the land use requirements outlined in PD-2.

Similar to the proposed Project, the Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts. However, due to the elimination of the indoor pool component under the Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative, overall impacts would be incrementally less than the proposed Project with the exception of land use and recreational impacts, which would be greater.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: The Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative would achieve some (Project Objectives 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15), but not all, of the Project Objectives. This alternative would not achieve two Project Objectives. The Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative would eliminate the indoor pools and convert the temporary pool to a permanent facility, which would not maximize the potential of the site as an aquatic recreational complex. Although the Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative would meet Project Objectives 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, it would not meet these objectives to the same degrees as the proposed Project. This alternative would also not meet any of the Project Objectives related to the provision of a new pool complex that would serve the recreation needs of the general public, as well as the needs of the established aquatic community served by the former Belmont Pool facility.

Finding: On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve the Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project. In light of these considerations, the Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed Project and is considered to be undesirable.

Facts in Support of the Finding: A fundamental objective of the proposed Project is to redevelop, modernize, and expand the former Belmont Pool complex with a modern pool complex to better serve the needs of the established aquatic community. The Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative would convert the existing temporary pool to a permanent facility, which would represent a 49 percent reduction in the total pool surface area provided as part of the proposed Project. As such, this alternative would not be able to meet the full demand for recreation and competition pool use, would not include permanent seating, and would not be able to host events to the same degree as the proposed Project. For this reason, this alternative would not maximize the potential of the site as an aquatic recreational complex and would

not meet the needs of the aquatic community. The Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative would generate significantly less revenue to cover operation and maintenance costs. Therefore, the reduction of aquatic facilities under this alternative would result in a less positive contribution to the City for operation and maintenance costs associated with this alternative. This alternative would be inconsistent with some of the Project Objectives, would not fully meet other Project Objectives, and would overall not provide the same benefits as the proposed Project. On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve the Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project. In light of these considerations, the Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed Project and is considered to be undesirable.

Outdoor Diving Well/Revised Site Plan

Description: This alternative would be similar to the proposed Project, but would locate the diving well outside the proposed pool facility. Locating the diving well outside the Bubble structure would reduce the height of the building. However, a height variance would still be required as the building would exceed the 30 ft height limit. Due to space constraints in the proposed outdoor aquatic area, the separate 115 sf whirlpool for divers would not be included in the Outdoor Diving Well/Revised Site Plan Alternative.

Environmental Effects: Although the Outdoor Diving Well/Revised Site Plan Alternative would move the diving well outside, reducing the pool square footage area by 115 sf, impacts related to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, global climate change, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, recreation, traffic, and utilities and service systems impacts would be similar to the proposed Project for this alternative. Operational impacts associated with aesthetics would be reduced due to the reduced project height. However, operational noise impacts would be greater when compared to the proposed Project due to the location of additional activities (including the outdoor diving well) to the outdoor pool area. Similar to the proposed Project, this alternative would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: The Outdoor Diving Well/Revised Site Plan Alternative would be consistent with many of the Project Objectives (Objectives 1, 4, 5, 6, and 7), but to a lesser extent as the proposed Project. The Outdoor Diving Well/Revised Site Plan Alternative, similar to the proposed Project, would redevelop and replace the former Belmont Pool with a more modern facility comprised of high-performance materials that better meet the needs of recreational and competitive swimmers, divers, aquatic sports participants, and additional pool users (Objectives 1, 2, and 10) and increases programmable water space to minimize scheduling conflicts (Objective 5) that occurred during the operations of the former Belmont Pool facility. This alternative and the proposed Project would locate the pool in an area that serves the existing users (Objective 13). The Outdoor Diving Well/Revised Site Plan Alternative would include a total pool surface area of 36,335 sf, only 115 sf less than the proposed Project (due to the loss of the whirlpool for divers). The increase in pool area would be comparable to the proposed Project and would alleviate the overcrowding and schedule conflicts of the former Belmont Pool. Therefore, the Outdoor Diving Well/Revised Site Plan Alternative would meet the needs of the aquatic community, similar to the proposed Project.

Finding: On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve the Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project. In light of these considerations, the Outdoor Diving Well/Revised Site Plan Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed Project and is considered to be undesirable.

Facts in Support of the Finding: A fundamental objective of the proposed Project is to redevelop, modernize, and expand the former Belmont Pool complex with a modern pool complex to better serve the needs of the established aquatic community. While the Outdoor Diving Well/Revised Site Plan Alternative would provide a similar amount of pool surface area as the proposed Project, the placement of the outdoor diving well is not considered desirable by the established aquatic community due to safety and weather concerns. The Outdoor Diving Well/Revised Site Plan Alternative would meet the majority of the Project Objectives, but to a lesser degree than the proposed Project. As a result, the Outdoor Diving Well/Revised Site Plan Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed Project.

Reduced Project-No Outdoor Components

Description: The No Outdoor Components Alternative is a Reduced Project Alternative, which would eliminate the outdoor pool component, including the recreation pool, competition pool, and the public address system. The indoor component, facility amenities, and building design components would remain in place; however, the size of the Plinth structure would be reduced and be centralized around the Bubble component of the proposed Project. The removal of the outdoor component would represent an approximately 20–30 percent reduction in the size of the building footprint and an approximately 49 percent reduction in the total pool area as compared to the proposed Project. As part of this alternative, the outdoor cafe would remain. A height variance would still be required under this alternative due to indoor diving well.

Environmental Effects: The No Outdoor Components Alternative would eliminate the outdoor pools and reduce the pool surface area by 49 percent as compared to the proposed Project. The Plinth and structural footprint would also be reduced and would result in an increase in open space. Although the outdoor pool component would be eliminated with the No Outdoor Components Alternative, impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, and land use would be similar to the proposed Project for this alternative.

Construction-related aesthetics, hydrology and water quality, air quality, global climate change, noise, and traffic impacts would be fewer than those under the proposed Project because construction activities would be reduced.

Operational-related impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, global climate change, hydrology and water quality, noise, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project. These impacts were determined to be less than significant for the proposed Project, and would remain less than significant for this alternative.

Compared to the proposed Project, recreational impacts are greater for the No Outdoor Components Alternative due to the reduction in available aquatic recreational opportunities as compared to the proposed Project.

Similar to the proposed Project, the No Outdoor Components Alternative would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts. However, due to the elimination of the outdoor pool component under the No Outdoor Components Alternative, overall impacts would be incrementally less than the proposed Project with the exception of recreational impacts, which would be greater.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: Similar to the proposed Project, the No Outdoor Components Alternative would replace the former Belmont Pool complex with a modern pool complex. However, because it would not include outdoor pools, this alternative would achieve some, but not all, of the Project Objectives. The No Outdoor Components Alternative would be consistent with Project Objectives 1, 7,

11, 12, 14, and 15 and would not meet them or the remaining Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project.

Finding: On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve the Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project. In light of these considerations, the No Outdoor Components Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed Project and is considered to be undesirable.

Facts in Support of the Finding: Similar to the proposed Project, the No Outdoor Components Alternative would not result in any significant impacts. In addition, although the No Outdoor Components Alternative would reduce the pool surface area by 49 percent as compared to the proposed Project, it would not expand the former Belmont Pool complex with more programmable space to better serve the needs of the established aquatic community, as desired by one of the Project objectives. Furthermore, the No Outdoor Components Alternative may generate significantly less revenue, thereby resulting in less positive contribution to the City to cover operation and maintenance costs associated with this alternative, when compared to the proposed Project. As a result, the No Outdoor Components Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed Project.

Reduced Project-No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components

Description: This alternative would be similar to No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components Alternative, but would eliminate the outdoor pool components and the indoor diving well component. The open space and park area would be expanded under this alternative as the footprint of the facility would be reduced. Although this alternative would reduce the height of the building, it would still require a height variance due to the height limitation of 30 ft for the Project site.

Environmental Effects: The No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components Alternative would eliminate the outdoor pools and diving well component, and, as a result, reduce the pool surface area by approximately 49 percent. The Plinth and structural footprint would also be reduced and would result in an increase in open space. Although the outdoor pools and diving well component would be eliminated with the No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components Alternative, impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, and land use would be similar to the proposed Project for this alternative.

Construction-related hydrology and water quality, air quality, global climate change, noise, and traffic impacts would be fewer than those under the proposed Project because construction activities would be reduced.

Operational-related impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, global climate change, hydrology and water quality, noise, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project. These impacts were determined to be less than significant for the proposed Project, and would remain less than significant for this alternative.

Compared to the proposed Project, recreational impacts are greater for the No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components Alternative due to the reduction in available recreational opportunities as compared to the proposed Project.

Similar to the proposed Project, the No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components Alternative would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts. However, due to the elimination of the outdoor pools and

diving well component under the reduced Project Alternative, overall impacts would be incrementally less than the proposed Project with the exception of recreational impacts, which would be greater.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: Similar to the proposed Project, the No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components Alternative would replace the former Belmont Pool complex with a modern pool complex. However, because it would not include outdoor pools or the diving well component, this alternative would achieve some, but not all, of the Project Objectives as the proposed Project. The elimination of the outdoor pools under this alternative would not maximize the potential of the site as an aquatic recreational complex. Although the No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components Alternative would meet Project Objectives 1, 7, 11, 12, 14, and 15, it would not meet these objectives or the remaining Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project.

Finding: On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve the Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project. In light of these considerations, the No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed Project and is considered to be undesirable.

Facts in Support of the Finding: A fundamental objective of the proposed Project is to redevelop, modernize, and expand the former Belmont Pool complex with a modern pool complex to better serve the needs of the established aquatic community. The No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components Alternative would provide 49 percent less pool area than the proposed Project. As such, while this alternative would redevelop and replace the former Belmont Pool with a more modern facility that better meets the needs of recreational and competitive swimmers, divers, and aquatic sports participants, and increases programmable water space to minimize scheduling conflicts, it does not meet these objectives to the same degree as the proposed Project. While this alternative would result in overall reduction of environmental impacts, on balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the failure of this alternative to provide the same level of beneficial attributes as the proposed Project. The No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components Alternative is less desirable than the proposed Project and is considered to be less desirable than the proposed Project. In light of these considerations, this alternative has been rejected in favor of the proposed Project.

IV. GENERAL FINDINGS

1. The plans for the proposed Project have been prepared and analyzed so as to provide for public involvement in the planning and CEQA processes.

2. To the degree that any impacts described in the Final EIR are perceived to have a less than significant effect on the environment or that such impacts appear ambiguous as to their effect on the environment as discussed in the Draft EIR, the City has responded to key environmental issues and has incorporated mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential environmental effects of the proposed Project to the maximum extent feasible.

3. Comments regarding the Draft EIR received during the public review period have been adequately responded to in written Responses to Comments included in the Final EIR. Any significant effects described in such comments were avoided or substantially lessened by the standard conditions and mitigation measures described in the Final EIR.

4. The analysis of the environmental effects and mitigation measures contained in the Draft EIR and the Final EIR represents the independent judgment and analysis of the City of Long Beach.

7.0 MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM

7.1 MITIGATION MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21081.6 (enacted by the passage of Assembly Bill 3180) mandates that the following requirements shall apply to all reporting or mitigation monitoring programs:

- The public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. For those changes which have been required or incorporated into the project at the request of a responsible agency or a public agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project, that agency shall, if so requested by the lead agency or a responsible agency, prepare and submit a proposed reporting or monitoring program.
- The lead agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which its decision is based.
- A public agency shall provide the measures to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment that are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures. Conditions of project approval may be set forth in referenced documents which address required mitigation measures or in the case of the adoption of a plan, policy, regulation, or other project, by incorporating the mitigation measures into the plan, policy, regulation, or project design.
- Prior to the close of the public review period for a draft environmental impact report (EIR) or mitigated negative declaration (MND), a responsible agency, or a public agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project, shall either submit to the lead agency complete and detailed performance objectives for mitigation measures which would address the significant effects on the environment identified by the responsible agency or agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project, or refer the lead agency to appropriate, readily available guidelines or reference documents. Any mitigation measures submitted to a lead agency by a responsible agency or an agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project shall be limited to measures which mitigate impacts to resources which are subject to the statutory authority of, and definitions applicable to, that agency. Compliance or noncompliance by a responsible agency or agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by a project with that requirement shall not limit that authority of the responsible agency or agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by a project, or the authority of the lead agency, to approve, condition, or deny projects as provided by this division or any other provision of law.

EXHIBIT B

7.2 MITIGATION MONITORING PROCEDURES

The mitigation monitoring and reporting program has been prepared in compliance with PRC Section 21081.6. It describes the requirements and procedures to be followed by the City of Long Beach (City) to ensure that all mitigation measures adopted as part of the proposed Belmont Pool Revitalization Project (proposed Project) will be carried out as described in this EIR.

Table 7.A lists each of the mitigation measures specified in this EIR and identifies the party or parties responsible for implementation and monitoring of each measure.

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures		Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
4.1 Aesthetics			
Mitigation Measure 4.1.1:	**Maintenance of Construction Barriers.** Prior to issuance of any construction permits, the City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that construction plans include the following note: During construction, the Construction Contractor shall ensure, through appropriate postings and daily visual inspections, that no unauthorized materials are posted on any temporary construction barriers or temporary pedestrian walkways, and that any such temporary barriers and walkways are maintained in a visually attractive manner. In the event that unauthorized materials or markings are discovered on any temporary construction barrier or temporary pedestrian walkway, the Construction Contractor shall remove such items within 48 hours.	Construction Contractor/ City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee	Prior to issuance of any construction permits and ongoing during construction
4.2 Air Quality			
The proposed Project would not result in any potentially significant impacts to air quality. No mitigation is required.			
4.3 Biology			
Mitigation Measure 4.3.1:	**Migratory Bird Treaty Act.** Tree and vegetation removal shall be restricted to outside the likely active nesting season (January 15 through September 1) for those bird species present or potentially occurring within the proposed Project area. That time period is inclusive of most other birds' nesting periods, thus maximizing avoidance of impacts to any nesting birds. If construction is proposed between January 15 and September 1, a qualified biologist familiar with local avian species and the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code shall conduct a preconstruction survey for nesting birds no more than 3 days prior to construction. The survey shall include the entire area that will be disturbed. The results of the survey shall be recorded in a memorandum and submitted to the City of Long Beach (City) Parks, Recreation, and Marine Director within 48 hours. If the survey is positive, and the nesting species are subject to the MBTA or the California Fish and Game Code, the	City of Long Beach Parks, Recreation, and Marine Director or designee	No more than 3 days prior to commencement of grading activities, if construction is proposed between January 15 and August 31.

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
occurring in depths of less than 23 ft, unless there are discoveries at shallower depths that warrant the presence of a paleontological monitor. In the event that there are any unanticipated discoveries, the on-call paleontologist shall be called to the site to assess the find for significance, and if necessary, prepare a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) as outlined below. If excavation will extend deeper than 23 ft, exclusive of pile-driving and vibro-replacement soil stabilization techniques, the paleontologist shall prepare a PRIMP for the proposed Project. The PRIMP should be consistent with the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists (SVP, 1995 and 2010) and shall include but not be limited to the following: • Attendance at the pre-grade conference or weekly tailgate meeting if the PRIMP is initiated after the commencement of grading, in order to explain the mitigation measures associated with the Project. • During construction excavation, a qualified vertebrate paleontological monitor shall initially be present on a full-time basis whenever excavation shall occur within the sediments that have a high paleontological sensitivity rating. Based on the significance of any recovered specimens, the qualified paleontologist may set up conditions that shall allow for monitoring to be scaled back to part-time as the Project progresses. However, if significant fossils begin to be recovered after monitoring has been scaled back, conditions shall also be specified that would allow increased monitoring as necessary. The monitor shall be equipped to salvage fossils and/or matrix samples as they are unearthed in order to avoid construction delays. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment in the area of the find in		

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
order to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. • The underlying sediments may contain abundant fossil remains that can only be recovered by a screening and picking matrix; therefore, these sediments shall occasionally be spot-screened through 1/8 to 1/20-inch mesh screens to determine whether microfossils exist. If microfossils are encountered, additional sediment samples (up to 6,000 pounds) shall be collected and processed through 1/20-inch mesh screens to recover additional fossils. Processing of large bulk samples is best accomplished at a designated location within the Project that shall be accessible throughout the Project duration but shall also be away from any proposed cut or fill areas. Processing is usually completed concurrently with construction, with the intent to have all processing completed before, or just after, Project completion. A small corner of a staging or equipment parking area is an ideal location. If water is not available, the location should be accessible for a water truck to occasionally fill containers with water. • Preparation of recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation. This includes the washing and picking of mass samples to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils and the removal of surplus sediment from around larger specimens to reduce the volume of storage for the repository and the storage cost. • Identification and curation of specimens into a museum repository with permanent retrievable storage, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (LACM). • Preparation of a report of findings with an appended itemized inventory of specimens. When submitted to the City Development Services Director, or designee, the report and		

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
	inventory would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.		
4.5 Geology and Soils			
Mitigation Measure 4.5.1:	**Conformance with the Project Geotechnical Studies.** All grading operations and construction shall be conducted in conformance with the recommendations included in the *Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for the Proposed Belmont Plaza Olympic Pool Revitalization Project,* prepared by MACTEC (April 14, 2009); the *Geotechnical Investigation for the Temporary Myrtha Pool and Associated Improvements, Belmont Plaza Revitalization,* prepared by GMU Geotechnical, Inc. (April 3, 2013); the *Preliminary Geotechnical Report for the Belmont Plaza Pool Rebuild-Revitalization* prepared by AESCO (April 24, 2014); and *Soil Corrosivity Evaluation for the Belmont Plaza Pool Facility Rebuild/Revitalization Project,* prepared by HDR Schiff (April 23, 2014), which together are referred to as the *Geotechnical Evaluations*. Design, grading, and construction shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of the City of Long Beach (City) Municipal Code (Title 18) and the California Building Code (CBC) applicable at the time of grading, appropriate local grading regulations, and the requirements of the Project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final written report, subject to review and approval by the City's Development Services Director, or designee, prior to commencement of grading activities. Specific requirements in the Final Geotechnical Report shall address: 1. Seismic design considerations and requirements for structures and nonstructural components permanently attached to structures	City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee	Prior to commencement of grading activities

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
2. Foundations including ground improvements (deep soil mixing and stone columns) and shallow foundation design 3. Earthwork, including site preparation for structural areas (building pad) and sidewalks, pavements, and other flatwork areas; fill material; temporary excavations; and trench backfill 4. Liquefaction 5. Site drainage 6. Slabs-on-grade and pavements 7. Retaining walls Additional site testing and final design evaluation shall be conducted by the Project geotechnical consultant to refine and enhance these requirements, if necessary. The City shall require the Project geotechnical consultant to assess whether the requirements in that report need to be modified or refined to address any changes in the Project features that occur prior to the start of grading. If the Project geotechnical consultant identifies modifications or refinements to the requirements, the City shall require appropriate changes to the final Project design and specifications. Grading plan review shall also be conducted by the City's Development Services Director, or designee, prior to the start of grading to verify that the requirements developed during the geotechnical design evaluation have been appropriately incorporated into the Project plans. Design, grading, and construction shall be conducted in accordance with the specifications of the Project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final report based on the CBC applicable at the time of grading and building and the City Building Code. On-site inspection during		

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
	grading shall be conducted by the Project geotechnical consultant and the City Building Official to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into Project plans.		
Mitigation Measure 4.5.2:	**Corrosive Soils.** Prior to issuance of any building permits, the City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that structural design conforms to the requirements of the geotechnical study with regard to the protection of ferrous metals and copper that will come into contact with on-site soil. In addition, on-site inspections shall be conducted during construction by the Project geotechnical consultant and/or City Building Official to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into Project plans. The measures specified in the geotechnical study for steel pipes, iron pipes, copper tubing, plastic and vitrified clay pipe, other pipes, concrete, post tensioning slabs, concrete piles, and steel piles shall be incorporated into the structural design and Project plans where ferrous metals (e.g., iron or steel) and/or copper may come into contact with on-site soils.	City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee/Geotechnical Consultant or City Building Official	Prior to issuance of any building permits; inspections during project construction
4.6 Global Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
The proposed Project would not result in potentially significant impacts related to Greenhouse Gases. No mitigation is required.			
4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Resources			
Mitigation Measure 4.7.1:	**Contingency Plan.** Prior to issuance of any excavation or grading permits or activities, the City of Long Beach (City) Fire Department (LBFD), or designee, shall review and approve a contingency plan that addresses the potential to encounter on-site unknown hazards or hazardous substances during construction activities. The plan shall require that if construction workers encounter underground tanks, gases, odors, uncontained spills, or other unidentified substances, the contractor shall stop work, cordon off the affected area, and notify the LBFD. The LBFD responder shall determine the next steps regarding possible site evacuation, sampling, and disposal of	City of Long Beach Fire Department, or designee	Prior to issuance of any excavation or grading permits or activities

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
	the substance consistent with local, State, and federal regulations.		
Mitigation Measure 4.7.2:	**Predemolition Surveys.** Prior to commencement of demolition and/or construction activities, the City LBFD, or designee, shall verify that predemolition surveys for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead (including sampling and analysis of all suspected building materials) shall be performed. All inspections, surveys, and analyses shall be performed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations (i.e., American Society for Testing and Materials E 1527-05, and 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Subchapter R, Toxic Substances Control Act [TSCA], Part 716). If the predemolition surveys do not find ACMs or lead-based pipes (LBPs), the inspectors shall provide documentation of the inspection and its results to the City LBFD, or designee, to confirm that no further abatement actions are required. If the predemolition surveys find evidence of ACMs or lead, all such materials shall be removed, handled, and properly disposed of by appropriately licensed contractors according to all applicable regulations during demolition of structures (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 745, 761, and 763). Air monitoring shall be completed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations both to ensure adherence to applicable regulations (e.g., South Coast Air Quality Management District [SCAQMD]) and to provide safety to workers. The City shall provide documentation (e.g., all required waste manifests, sampling, and air monitoring analytical results) to the LBFD showing that abatement of any ACMs or lead identified in these structures has been completed in full compliance with all applicable regulations and approved by the appropriate regulatory agencies (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 716, 745, 761, 763, and 795 and California Code of Regulations Title 8, Article 2.6). An Operating	City of Long Beach Fire Department, or designee	Prior to commencement of demolition and/or construction activities

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
	and Maintenance Plan shall be prepared for any ACM or lead to remain in place and shall be reviewed and approved by the LBFD.		
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality			
Mitigation Measure 4.8.1:	**Construction General Permit.** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Long Beach (City) shall obtain coverage for the proposed Project under the State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System *General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities* (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, Permit No. CAS000002), as amended by Order Nos. 2010-0004-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ (Construction General Permit), or subsequent issuance. For projects with a disturbed area of 5 or more acres, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with construction Best Management Plans (BMPs) is required to be submitted to both the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the City. The City shall provide the Waste Discharge Identification Numbers to the Development Services Director to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Construction General Permit. A SWPPP shall be prepared and implemented for the proposed Project in compliance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. The SWPPP shall identify construction BMPs to be implemented to ensure that the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation is minimized and to control the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff as a result of construction activities.	City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee	Prior to issuance of a grading permit
Mitigation Measure 4.8.2:	**Dewatering During Construction Activities.** During project construction, the City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee, shall ensure that any dewatering activities during construction shall comply with the requirements of the *Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in*	City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee	Ongoing during any dewatering activities during project construction

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
	Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (Order No. R4-2013-0095, Permit No. CAG994004) (Groundwater Discharge Permit) or subsequent permit. This Groundwater Discharge Permit shall include submission of a Notice of Intent (NOI) for coverage under the permit to the Los Angeles RWQCB at least 45 days prior to the start of dewatering and compliance with all applicable provisions in the permit, including water sampling, analysis, and reporting of dewatering-related discharges. If dewatered groundwater cannot meet the discharge limitations specified in the Groundwater Discharge Permit, a permit shall be obtained from the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) to discharge groundwater to the sewer per LACSD's Wastewater Ordinance.		
Mitigation Measure 4.8.3:	**Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City shall submit a Final Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) for the proposed Project to the Development Services Director for review and approval. Project-specific site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Control BMPs contained in the Final SUSMP shall be incorporated into final design. The BMPs shall be consistent with the requirements of the *Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) Design Manual*. Additionally, the BMPS shall be designed and maintained to target pollutants of concern and reduce runoff from the Project site. The SUSMP shall include an operations and maintenance plan for the prescribed Treatment Control BMPs to ensure their long-term performance.	City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee	Prior to issuance of grading permits
Mitigation Measure 4.8.4:	**Hydrology Reports.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City shall submit a final hydrology report for the proposed Project to the Development Services Director, or designee, for review and approval. The hydrology report shall demonstrate, based on hydrologic calculations, that the proposed Project's on-site storm conveyance and detention and infiltration facilities are designed in	City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee	Prior to issuance of grading permits

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
	accordance with the requirement of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Hydrology Manual.		
Mitigation Measure 4.8.5:	**Floodplain Report.** During final design, the Project engineer shall prepare and submit a floodplain/hydrology report to the City Development Services Director, or designee, to address any potential impacts to the floodplain and, if required, reduce those impacts. The report shall comply with City and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations and shall not increase the base flood elevation by more than 1 foot. Detailed analysis shall be conducted to ensure that the Project design specifically addresses floodplain issues so that the proposed Project complies with local and FEMA regulations on floodplains.	Project Engineer/City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee	During final design
4.9 Land Use			
The proposed Project would not result in potentially significant impacts related to land use. No mitigation is required.			
4.10 Noise			
Mitigation Measure 4.10.1:	Prior to issuance of the occupancy permit, the City of Long Beach's (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that a sound engineer has designed the permanent and temporary sound systems such that the City's exterior noise standards (daytime exterior noise level of 50 dBA L_{50}) are not exceeded at the surrounding sensitive land uses. Measures capable of reducing the noise levels include, but are not limited to: • Reducing the source levels; • Reducing the speaker elevations; • Directing the speakers away from adjacent noise-sensitive land uses; and • Using highly directional speakers.	City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee	Prior to issuance of the occupancy permit
Mitigation Measure 4.10.2:	Prior to issuance of demolition or grading permits, the City of Long Beach's (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that construction and grading plans include the following conditions to reduce potential construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors:	City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee	Prior to issuance of demolition or grading permits

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
	• During all site excavation and grading, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards; • The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the Project site; • The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging to create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the Project site during all Project construction; • The construction contractor shall ensure that engine idling from construction equipment (i.e., bulldozers and haul trucks) is limited to a maximum of 5 minutes at any given time; and • The construction contractor shall ensure that all construction activities are scheduled to avoid operating several pieces of heavy equipment simultaneously. • Construction, drilling, repair, remodeling, alteration, or demolition work shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday. In accordance with City standards, no construction activities are permitted outside of these hours.		
Mitigation Measure 4.10.3:	Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Long Beach Tidelands Capital Improvement Division shall hold a community preconstruction meeting in concert with the construction contractor to provide information to the public regarding the construction schedule. The construction schedule information shall include the duration of each construction activity and the specific location, days, frequency, and duration of the pile driving that will occur	City of Long Beach Tidelands Capital Improvement Division	Prior to issuance of a grading permit

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
	during each phase of the Project construction. Public notification of this meeting shall be undertaken in the same manner as the Notice of Availability mailings for this Draft Environmental Impact Report.		
4.11 Recreation			
With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.12.2, as identified in the Transportation and Traffic section, short-term construction-related impacts on recreational resources would be less than significant.			
4.12 Transportation and Traffic			
Mitigation Measure 4.12.1:	**Event Traffic Management Plan.** In the event that a large special event (defined as more than 450 spectators) is held at Belmont Pool, the City of Long Beach (City) Parks and Recreation Director, or designee, shall develop an Event Traffic Management Plan for review and approval by the City Traffic Engineer. The plan shall be designed by a registered Traffic Engineer and shall address potential impacts to traffic circulation and the steps necessary to minimize potential impacts (e.g., active traffic management and/or off-site parking and shuttles) during the large special event.	City of Long Beach Parks and Recreation Department Director, or designee/City Traffic Engineer	Prior to any large special event (defined as more than 450 spectators)
Mitigation Measure 4.12.2:	**Construction Traffic Management Plan.** Prior to the issuance of any demolition permits, the City of Long Beach (City) Parks and Recreation Director, or designee, shall develop a Construction Traffic Management Plan for review and approval by the City Traffic Engineer. The plan shall be designed by a registered Traffic Engineer and shall address traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation and public transit routes and shall ensure that emergency vehicle access is maintained. The plan shall identify the routes that construction vehicles shall use to access the site, the hours of construction traffic, traffic controls and detours, and off-site staging areas. The plan shall also require that a minimum of one travel lane in each direction on Ocean Boulevard be kept open during construction activities. Access to Belmont Veterans' Memorial Pier, the Shoreline Beach Bike Path, and the beach shall be maintained at all times. The	City of Long Beach Parks and Recreation Director, or designee/ City Traffic Engineer	Prior to the issuance of any demolition permits

EXHIBIT B

Table 7.A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Responsible Party	Timing for Mitigation Measure
Construction Traffic Management Plan shall also require that access to the pier, the bike path, and the beach be kept open during construction activities. The plan shall also require the City to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt		
4.13 Utilities and Service Systems		
With implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.8.2 and 4.8.4, as identified in the Hydrology and Water Quality Section, impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant.		

EXHIBIT B