RESOLUTION NO. RES-19-0188

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH CERTIFYING THAT THE RECIRCULATED PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ("RPEIR 03-16"), TOGETHER WITH A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM ("MMRP") FOR THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE AND URBAN DESIGN ELEMENTS PROJECT IN THE CITY OF LONG BEACH (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2015051054), 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 A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS ("SOC") AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney
411 West Ocean Boulevard, 9th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

WHEREAS, the City of Long Beach has proposed the General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Elements Project ("Project") involving an update to the City's existing General Plan to guide growth and future development within the City through the horizon year 2040, including the approval of both the General Plan Land Use Element ("LUE") and Urban Design Element ("UDE"), which would replace the City's existing LUE and the City's existing Scenic Routes Element ("SRE"), respectively;

Said Project is more fully described in the Recirculated Program Environmental Impact Report ("RPEIR") for the General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Elements Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2015051054), a copy of which RPEIR, 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 RPEIR;

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared in accordance with CEQA which concluded that an Environmental Impact Report would be the appropriate level of review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines section 15161;

WHEREAS, the City began an evaluation of the proposed project by issuing a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a Program level Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), which report was circulated from May 18, 2015 to June 16, 2015. A Notice of Completion was prepared and filed with the State Office of Planning and Research initially on May 18, 2015, and again on June 18, 2019;

WHEREAS, after a public hearing and due to substantial changes made to the maps of the Land Use Element after the PEIR was circulated for public review, the PEIR was recirculated between June 18, 2019 and August 16, 2019;

WHEREAS, implementation of the Project constitutes a "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, the City prepared full and complete responses to the comments received on the RPEIR, and distributed the responses in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21092.5;

WHEREAS, the City Council has carefully reviewed and considered all environmental documentation comprising the Final RPEIR, including but not limited to the Draft PEIR, the Recirculated PEIR, and any revisions and additions thereto, the technical appendices and referenced documents, and the public comments and responses thereto, and conducted a duly noticed City Council public hearing held on December 3, 2019, at which time evidence, both written and oral, was presented to and considered by the City Council;

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney
411 West Ocean Boulevard, 9th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

WHEREAS, the City Council after having carefully reviewed and considered all relevant environmental documentation and public comment thereto has found that the Final PEIR considers all potentially significant environmental impacts of the Project and is complete and adequate, and fully complies with all requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines;

WHEREAS, at said December 3, 2019 public hearing, the City Council considered all significant impacts, mitigation measures, and Project alternatives identified in the Final RPEIR, and found that all potentially significant impacts of the Project have been lessened or avoided to the extent feasible.

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

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

Section 2. The RPEIR is adequate and provides good faith disclosure of available information on the Project, and all reasonable and feasible alternatives thereto, and has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

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

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 of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations Regarding the Final Environmental Impacts for the General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Elements 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. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d), the City Council hereby adopts and approves the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which is contained in Section 7.0 of the

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney
411 West Ocean Boulevard, 9th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

RPEIR and is hereby made a part hereof by this reference, with respect to the significant environmental effects identified in the Final PEIR, and hereby makes and adopts the provisions of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as mitigation measures for the Project.

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, City Hall, Department of Development Services, 3rd Floor, 333 W. Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, California, and at the new City Hall, Department of Development Services, 411 W. Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor, Long Beach, California, and is, and has been, available for review during normal business hours.

Section 7. The information provided in the various staff reports submitted in connection with the Project, the corrections and modifications, if any, to the Final Recirculated PEIR 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 further re-circulation of the Recirculated Final EIR pursuant to the Public Resources Code.

//

//

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney
411 West Ocean Boulevard, 9th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Section 8. 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 December 3, 2019, by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers: Pearce, Price, Mungo, Andrews, Uranga, Austin, Richardson.

Noes: Councilmembers: Supernaw.

Absent: Councilmembers: Zendejas.

City Clerk

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney
411 West Ocean Boulevard, 9th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Exhibit A

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

LONG BEACH GENERAL PLAN LAND USE AND URBAN DESIGN ELEMENTS PROJECT

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2015051054

I. BACKGROUND

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires decision-makers to balance the benefits of the Long Beach General Plan Land Use and Urban Design 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 planning area includes the entire 50 square miles within the limits of the City of Long Beach (City) (excluding the City of Signal Hill, which is completely surrounded by the City of Long Beach) in Los Angeles County (County), California. The City is bordered on the west by the Cities of Carson and Los Angeles (including Wilmington and the Port of Los Angeles); on the north by the Cities of Compton, Paramount, and Bellflower; and on the east by the Cities of Lakewood, Hawaiian Gardens, Cypress, Los Alamitos, and Seal Beach. The City is also bordered by the unincorporated communities of Rancho Dominguez to the north and Rossmoor to the east. The Pacific Ocean borders the southern portion of the City, and as such, portions of the City are located within the California Coastal Zone.

The proposed project is an update to the City's existing General Plan and is intended to guide growth and future development through the year 2040. The proposed project includes the approval of both the General Plan Land Use Element (LUE) and the General Plan Urban Design Element (UDE), which would replace the existing LUE and the Scenic Routes Element (SRE) respectively. The following discussion summarizes the key components of each of the proposed General Plan Elements.

Land Use Element. The proposed LUE would introduce the concept of "PlaceTypes," which would replace the current approach in the existing LUE of segregating property within the City through traditional land uses designations and zoning classifications. The updated LUE would establish 14 primary PlaceTypes that would divide the City into distinct neighborhoods, thus allowing for greater flexibility and a mix of compatible land uses within these areas. Each PlaceType would be defined by unique land use, form, and character-defining goals, policies, and implementation strategies tailored specifically to the particular application of that PlaceType within the City. The proposed 14 PlaceTypes are listed below.ax

1. Open Space
2. Founding and Contemporary Neighborhood
3. Multi-Family Residential—Low

4. Multi-Family Residential—Moderate
5. Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors—Low
6. Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors—Moderate
7. Transit-Oriented Development-Low
8. Transit-Oriented Development- Moderate
9. Community Commercial
10. Industrial
11. Neo-Industrial
12. Regional-Serving Facility
13. Downtown
14. Waterfront

The LUE update proposes allowing opportunity for major changes to approximately 13 percent of the City. These areas are referred to as "Major Areas of Change" throughout the LUE and signify areas where growth is anticipated to be most profound. However, areas that are not designated as "Major Areas of Change" and/or are not anticipated to result in changes in existing land use patterns may also experience demographic growth. The establishment of PlaceTypes in place of standard parcel-by-parcel land use designations would allow for greater flexibility in development types to create distinct residential neighborhoods, employment centers, and open space areas.

Urban Design Element. The UDE would be an entirely new element of the City's General Plan and would replace the existing SRE upon approval by the City Council. While the LUE focuses on specific parcels, the goals and policies of the UDE focus on "the stuff in between," such as building form, space between buildings, pedestrian space, public open space, connectivity and linkages, and a building's relationships to the street. The UDE supports PlaceType development with an emphasis on development patterns, streetscapes, and urban form components; and how PlaceTypes relate internally and with adjacent PlaceTypes.

The decision to include a UDE in the City's General Plan grew from the City's stated need to provide an urban framework that addresses the varying aesthetic characteristics associated with the historic districts, traditional neighborhoods, auto-oriented commercial centers, urbanized centers, and corridors located throughout the City.

Project Objectives

The City has established the following intended objectives, which would aid decision-makers in their review of the project and its associated environmental impacts:

1. Promote livability, including environmental quality, community health, and safety, the quality of the built environment, and economic vitality.

2. Meet the City's housing needs as identified in the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Requirement (7,048 new dwelling units by the year 2021) and the Assessment of Fair Housing (21,476 housing units to address existing housing needs) by diversifying housing opportunities through the provision of a variety of housing types and the provision of market-rate and affordable housing units.

3. Accommodate strategic growth in the Downtown area, around regional-serving facilities, along major corridors, and in transit-oriented development areas; create and preserve open space; accommodate economic development by converting industrial areas to neo-industrial uses in appropriate locations, promote regional-serving uses, convert industrial uses to commercial uses in locations more suitable for commercial character, and revitalize the Waterfront areas.

4. Implement sustainable planning and development practices by creating compact new developments and walkable neighborhoods to minimize the City's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) and energy usage.

5. Create job growth allowing for new businesses while also maintaining and preserving existing employment opportunities at the City's regional facilities and employment centers. Promote increased employment opportunities for Long Beach residents at differing levels of educational and skill attainment.

6. Promote changes in land use and development that reflect changes in the regional economy. Promote land uses that transform now-vacant or under-utilized former employment centers into new sources of employment.

7. Provide high-quality housing in a variety of forms, sizes, and densities to serve the diverse population of the City.

8. Preserve low-density neighborhoods while improving pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access in these areas.

9. Ensure fair and equitable land use by making planning decisions that would ensure the fair and equitable distribution of services, amenities, and investments throughout the City.

10. Provide reliable public facilities and infrastructure by expanding and maintaining the current infrastructure to serve new and existing developments in the City.

11. Increase access to green and open space through the creation of urban open spaces and greenscapes and providing for clean beaches, waterways, preserves, and parklands.

12. Restore and reconnect with local natural reserves through the utilization of clean energy, best management practices (BMPs), and current technologies.

13. Create "Great Places" places by improving the connectivity, the visual appearance of and development of public spaces; promote sustainable design practices; encourage design techniques that foster economic development; preserve historic districts and the unique character of each neighborhood; provide for public art; and expand the unified sign program to increase wayfinding within neighborhoods and PlaceTypes.

14. Improve the urban fabric by creating complete neighborhoods and community blocks, properly place and design new development to prevent visual and land use conflicts; promote compact urban and infill development, clearly define boundaries between natural and urbanized areas, preserve iconic buildings; and provide pedestrian furniture and wide sidewalks to create walkable blocks.

15. Preserve the City's natural features, open space, and parks throughout the City, while also providing new public spaces throughout the community, parks, and plazas at infill sites, and parklets along sidewalks, particularly in areas with the least access to greenspace.

16. Encourage building form and design to improve the interface between buildings and streets; develop areas along public sidewalks that promote streets as "public rooms;" design parking lots and access points to be pedestrian-friendly; provide buffers along streetscapes to buffer parking areas and promote walkability; provide bicycle infrastructure; establish safe transit infrastructure; and design streetscapes utilizing sustainable streetscape strategies.

17. Promote high-quality design of the built environment. Enhance visual interest, improve functionality, and inspire pride through thoughtful design, high-quality materials, and a diversity of architectural styles throughout neighborhoods and the entire City.

In addition to these 17 objectives, both the LUE and the UDE contain numerous goals, policies, and implementation strategies to guide the use of land, urban form, and the aesthetic character of the City. These Citywide policies aim to provide a holistic and comprehensive guide for the City, whereas future projects facilitated by project approval would provide a refined direction for distinct areas within the City.

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 May 18 to June 16, 2015. A public Scoping Meeting was held on May 27, 2015, in order to present the project and to receive public comments on the IS. 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 comments.
- The City conducted two study sessions on June 4, 2016, and October 6, 2016, to introduce the project to the City's Planning Commission, discuss the programmatic requirements and conceptual plans for the proposed project, and engage citizen participation in developing the proposed project.
- The City prepared a Draft EIR, which was made available for a 78-day public review period, from September 1 to November 18, 2016. The City prepared a Final Recirculated EIR, including the Response to Comments to the Draft EIR and the Findings of Fact. The Final Recirculated EIR/Response to Comments contains comments on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments, revisions to the Draft EIR in the form of an Errata, and appended documents.
- The City held a public hearing with the Planning Commission on February 2, 2017 to consider a recommendation that the City Council certify the Final Program EIR. The action was held in Commission at that time. A study session on the LUE and UDE was conducted on June 15, 2017. On August 17, 2017, the City held another public hearing with the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation that the City Council certify the Final Program EIR. The action was held over at that time and on December 11, 2017, the Planning Commission recommended revisions to the PlaceType and Height maps as part of their recommendation to the Long Beach City Council to confirm the proposed LUE and UDE PlaceType and Height Maps and direct staff to update the EIR.
- On March 6, 2018, the Long Beach City Council put forward further changes to the PlaceType and Height maps and voted at a public hearing to confirm those final General Plan Land Use Element and

Urban Design Element PlaceType and Heights Maps and directed staff update the EIR. Since the maps were substantially revised after the 2016 EIR comment period, and technical updates were made to the plans to reflect these changes, staff prepared an updated PEIR given that significant new information was added after public notice was given of the availability of the Draft EIR, but before the certification of the EIR. In this instance, recirculation is required due to the substantial changes made to the LUE maps by City Council.

- As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (*State CEQA Guidelines*) Section 15087, a Notice of Completion (NOC) of the Recirculated Draft EIR was filed with the State Clearinghouse on June 18, 2019, and a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the proposed project was filed with the County of Los Angeles (County) Clerk on June 18, 2019. The Recirculated Draft EIR was circulated for public review for an extended period of 60 days, from June 18, 2019, to August 16, 2019, longer than the mandatory 45-day review period. The NOA and/or copies of the Recirculated Draft EIR were distributed to all Responsible Agencies and to the State Clearinghouse in addition to various public agencies, citizen groups, and interested individuals. Copies of the Recirculated Draft EIR were also made available for public review at the City Development Services Department, all local libraries in the City, and on the City's website. Prior commenters on the project were notified of its availability, including all those who commented on the previous PEIR in 2016 and attendees who signed-in and provided their email addresses during the 2017 outreach process. Per section 15088.5(f)(1) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the NOA stated that since the Recirculated Draft EIR had been substantially revised, the City required that reviewers submit new comments on the revised project addressed in the Recirculated EIR. As such, the City was not required to respond again to comments received during the previous comment period for the 2016 Draft EIR, although all comments received during the previous comment period are included in the administrative record.

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 IS/NOP and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the proposed project;
- The 2016 Draft & Final EIR for the proposed project;
- All written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Recirculated Draft EIR;
- All responses to written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Recirculated Draft EIR;
- All written and verbal public testimony presented during any noticed public hearings 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 Recirculated Draft EIR and Final Recirculated EIR;
- The Recirculated Draft and Final EIR for the proposed project;

- 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, 411 West Ocean Boulevard, 3rd 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 City offices of the Development Services Department. This information is provided in compliance with PRC Section 21081.6(a)(2) and *State CEQA 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 May 18, 2015, 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 either the 2016 Draft EIR or the Recirculated Draft EIR. In addition, the City found that the proposed project would result in no environmental effects with respect to several new subject areas that were added to Appendix G in the *State CEQA Guidelines* that went into effect in 2018. Based upon the environmental analysis documented in Chapter 2.0 of the Final Recirculated 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. Although Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) is designated as an Eligible State Scenic Highway, 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 City is highly urbanized and is almost entirely developed. There are no areas in the City that are designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. In addition, there are no areas currently zoned, designated, or used for agricultural uses. Additionally, no Williamson Act contracts exist within the City. Furthermore, the proposed LUE also encourages the creation of small-scale agricultural uses (e.g. community gardens, edible gardens, and small urban farms) (LU Policy 11-3, LU Policy 18-3, LU-M-40, and LU-M-88). No areas in the City are zoned or used as forest land, timberland, or for timberland production. Therefore, 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.

Biological Resources: Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species. In its existing setting, the planning area is almost entirely developed and is located in an urban area of Los Angeles County. These urban areas do not contain mapped habitat for any sensitive biological species as identified on local/regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Although the majority of the planning area is urban in nature, the City contains a number of open space areas (e.g., El Dorado Regional Park, the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers, Los Cerritos Wetlands, beaches along the Pacific Ocean Shoreline, rights-of-way, marinas, bays, and wetlands) that have the potential to support sensitive biological resources. In order to preserve open space areas and protect sensitive biological resources, the proposed LUE aims to promote compact infill development on underutilized parcels located throughout the City (LU Policy 1-5, LU Policy 7-11, and Major Area of Change No. 7). The majority of parcels proposed for infill development are either paved or developed with uses that would be redeveloped as part of the proposed project. As such, these areas have previously been heavily disturbed and do not support sensitive biological resources. Therefore, the proposed LUE would protect and retain open space areas and would not have a substantial adverse effect on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, polices, or regulations by the CDFW or the USFWS. No impacts are anticipated.

Biological Resources: Riparian, Sensitive Natural Communities, Wetlands. The proposed project would establish goals, policies, and implementation strategies aimed at improving and maintaining existing riparian and sensitive habitat in the City. For example, the proposed LUE would establish the Open Space PlaceType, which would encourage the preservation of existing wildlife habitat areas and would protect existing water bodies and habitat areas with known sensitive biological resources (Major Area of Change No. 8, LU Strategy No. 20, and LU Policies 20-1 through 20-4). Therefore, no impacts to riparian habitat, natural communities, or federally protected wetlands are anticipated.

Biological Resources: Migratory Fish or Wildlife Species or Established Migratory Corridors. The proposed project would establish the Open Space PlaceType, which would encourage the preservation and re-establishment of existing wildlife habitat areas in the City. The establishment of the Open Space PlaceType would serve to maintain existing wildlife movement corridors. Specifically, the LU Policy 20-12 in the proposed LUE requires that future development projects in the City comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (Title 33, United States Code, Section 703 et seq., see also Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 10 and Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code), which makes it illegal to take any migratory bird, nests, or eggs of such a bird except under the terms of a valid federal permit. For example, future development projects would avoid impacts to migratory birds during construction activities by limiting such activities to outside of the nesting season and/or by conducting nesting bird surveys prior to any tree removal. The proposed LUE also encourages the establishment of wildlife movement corridors between urban areas, wetlands, and the San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers (LU Policy 20-7 and LU Policy 21-5). No impacts are anticipated.

Biological Resources: Conflict with any Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resource (i.e., Tree Preservation Policy/Ordinance). The proposed project is also a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in the removal of any trees or be in conflict with any City biological policies or ordinances. However, LU Policy 20-12 requires future projects to comply with Chapter 14.28 of the Long Beach Municipal Code to ensure consistency with the City's tree preservation policy. Future individual projects requiring a discretionary action resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines,* and would be required to obtain ministerial

permits for any proposed tree removals on City-owned property. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in potential conflicts with the City's tree preservation policy. 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 regulating biological resources in the City; therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any such plans. No impacts are anticipated.

Cultural Resources: Historic Resources. The proposed project would aim to encourage new development while preserving the character of federal, State, and City-designated historic buildings and neighborhoods throughout the City. The proposed project includes a number of goals and policies aimed at preserving and maintaining the integrity of existing historic resources located throughout the planning area. Specifically, the proposed UDE includes strategies aimed at the preservation of the aesthetic character of existing historic resources (UD Strategy No. 9, Policy UD 2-1, Policy UD 9-1, Policy UD 9-2, Policy UD 9-3, Policy UD 10-1, Policy UD 10-3, Policy UD 19-4, and Policy UD 20-5), while the proposed LUE aims to preserve existing historic structures and neighborhoods throughout the City (LU Goal No. 4, Strategy No. 3, LU-M-3, and LU-M-43). Historic resources are further protected through regulation via the City's General Plan Historic Preservation Element (2010) and the City's Cultural Heritage Ordinance, which are contemplated and recognized in the LUE and UDE; the proposed project is consistent with these documents and does not modify either of them. Additionally, future individual projects requiring a discretionary action resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines,* and would be reviewed to determine whether any potential historic resources would be impacted. No impacts are anticipated.

Cultural Resources: Archaeological Resources. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in impacts to archaeological resources in the City. However, the proposed LUE includes Policy 20-12, which requires future projects to minimize potential impacts to unknown archaeological resources by ensuring appropriate treatment and documentation of the discovery in accordance with applicable guidelines. Future individual projects requiring discretionary review resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. As a result, the proposed project would not result in impacts to archaeological resources as defined in PRC Section 15064.5. No impacts are anticipated.

Cultural Resources: Human Remains. While the City is known to have several areas that are considered to be sensitive for cultural resources, the proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would result in the disturbance of human remains in the City. In accordance with Senate Bill 18 (SB 18) requirements, the City contacted Native American representatives in early 2014. The representatives that were contacted were identified on a list of contacts provided by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Of the 10 Native American representatives that were contacted, responses were received from two individuals: John Tommy Rosas of the Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation and Andrew Salas of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians. While both individuals noted that the City has several areas that are considered sensitive for cultural resources, approval of the project would not include any physical improvements that would result in the disturbance of such resources. In accordance with SB 18, Assembly Bill 52 (which went into effect in 2017 after the distribution of the Initial Study for the project), and requests by the two Native American representatives, the City will notify Native American representatives of future projects in the City that require a discretionary action., The proposed LUE includes Policy 20-12, which requires future projects to minimize potential impacts to unknown buried human remains by ensuring appropriate examination, treatment, and protection of human remains (in the

event of an unanticipated discovery) in accordance with applicable regulations. In addition, future individual projects requiring discretionary review resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. The City would also notify Native American representatives of future projects occurring as a result of project approval to further minimize impacts associated with the potential disturbance of unknown human remains. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts as a result of surface fault rupture. Future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988)and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, future individual projects facilitated from approval of the proposed project would be required to comply with LU Policy 20-12, which requires compliance with current building codes to reduce potential impacts associated with seismic hazards. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects related to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, or seismic- related failure (e.g., liquefaction or landslides). No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Strong Seismic Ground Shaking. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts as a result of strong seismic ground shaking. Future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. The proposed project also includes LU Policy 20-12, which requires future projects to comply with Chapter 18.05 of the City's Municipal Code, which itself requires applicants to prepare a soils engineering report and/or geology report and comply with applicable geology and soils engineering recommendations prior to issuance of a grading permit. Compliance with the Building Code in effect at the time future projects are proposed and preparation of site-specific geology and soils engineering studies would ensure that future projects would not result in impacts related to strong seismic groundshaking. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Liquefaction. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts as a result of liquefaction. Furthermore, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions for project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. The proposed project also includes LU Policy 20-12, which requires future projects to comply with Chapter 18.05 of the City's Municipal Code, which itself requires applicants to prepare a soils engineering report and/or geology report and comply with applicable geology and soils engineering recommendations prior to issuance of a grading permit. Compliance with the Building Code in effect at the time future projects are proposed and preparation of site-specific geology and soils engineering studies would ensure that future projects would not result in impacts related to liquefaction. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Landslides. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts as a result of landslides. Furthermore, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and

would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. The proposed project also includes LU Policy 20-12, which requires future projects to comply with Chapter 18.05 of the City's Municipal Code, which itself requires applicants to prepare a soils engineering report and/or geology report and comply with applicable geology and soils engineering recommendations prior to issuance of a grading permit. Compliance with the Building Code in effect at the time future projects are proposed and preparation of site-specific geology and soils engineering studies would ensure that future projects would not result in impacts related to landslides. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Soil Erosion. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts associated with soil erosion due to a loss of topsoil. Furthermore, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Furthermore, future projects on sites larger than one acre would also be required to comply with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program's General Construction Permit (which requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to further ensure that no impacts with respect to soil erosion occur. The proposed project also includes LU Policy 20-12, which requires future projects to comply with Chapter 18.05 of the City's Municipal Code, which itself requires applicants to prepare a soils engineering report and/or geology report and comply with applicable geology and soils engineering recommendations prior to issuance of a grading permit. Compliance with the Building Code in effect at the time future projects are proposed and preparation of site-specific geology and soils engineering studies would ensure that future projects would not result in impacts related to soil erosion. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Unstable Soils. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts as a result of unstable soils. Future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. The proposed project also includes LU Policy 20-12, which requires future projects to comply with Chapter 18.05 of the City's Municipal Code, which itself requires applicants to prepare a soils engineering report and/or geology report and comply with applicable geology and soils engineering recommendations prior to issuance of a grading permit. Compliance with the Building Code in effect at the time future projects are proposed and preparation of site-specific geology and soils engineering studies would ensure that future projects would not result in impacts related to unstable soils. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Expansive Soils. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts as a result of expansive soils. Future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. The proposed project also includes LU Policy 20-12, which requires future projects to comply with Chapter 18.05 of the City's Municipal Code, which itself requires applicants to prepare a soils engineering report and/or geology report and comply with applicable geology and soils engineering recommendations prior to issuance of a grading permit. Compliance with the Building Code in effect at the time future projects are proposed and preparation of site-specific geology

and soils engineering studies would ensure that future projects would not result in impacts related to expansive soils. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Paleontological Resources. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in impacts to paleontological resources in the City. However, the proposed LUE includes Policy 20-12, which requires future projects to minimize potential impacts to paleontological by ensuring appropriate treatment and documentation of the discovery in accordance with applicable regulations. In addition, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. As a result, the proposed project would not result in impacts to paleontological resources as defined in PRC Section 15064.5. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Septic Tanks. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements nor would the project include the use of septic tanks or alternative methods for disposal of wastewater into subsurface soils. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any impacts affecting the capability of existing soils to adequately support the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be required to comply with current building codes, and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. No impacts are anticipated.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Hazardous Materials. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in impacts associated with the release of hazardous materials into the environment. However, future individual projects resulting from project approval would result in construction activities that would potentially use a limited amount of hazardous and flammable substances/oils (e.g., fuels, lubricants, and solvents) typical during heavy equipment operation. The amount and use of hazardous chemicals during future construction activities would be regulated by existing government rules and regulations, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and the California Code of Regulations (Title 22).

In addition, future developments facilitated by project approval would result in long-term operational activities associated with varying land use types that could result in the use and storage of potentially hazardous materials. However, such materials would be required to be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. In addition, future projects would be required to comply with LU Policy 20-12, which requires the preparation of pre-demolition surveys for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs), lead-based paints (LBPs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and mold on properties where such materials have been identified and/or if there is a likelihood that these materials pose a hazard at a subject property. LU Policy 20-12 also requires future project applicants to prepare a Contingency Plan that would outline procedures to be followed should unknown hazardous materials be encountered on a subject property during construction activities.

Future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. As a result, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the routine transport, use and/or disposal of hazardous materials; would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment due to the release of hazardous materials; and would not emit hazardous emissions or release hazardous materials into the environment within 0.25 mile of a school. No impacts are anticipated.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Hazardous Materials Site. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in impacts associated with the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to significant hazards to the public or the environment as a result of development on a listed hazardous materials site. No impacts are anticipated.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Public Airports. The Long Beach Airport is located in the central portion of the City, north of Interstate 405 (I-405) between Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard. In addition, portions of the western area of the City are within the influence area for the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base. Although project approval would allow for greater building heights and intensity, future developments would be required to comply with land use, noise, and height regulations outlined in the Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) prepared for the Long Beach Airport and the Airport Environs Land Use Plan prepared for the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base. Therefore, the project would not interfere with air traffic patterns, conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones, conflict with building height standards established by the FAA for structures on and adjacent to the Long Beach Airport, or result in the exposure of people residing in the area to excessive airport noise. Future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to safety hazards resulting from conflicts with existing air traffic patterns at a public airport. No impacts are anticipated.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Private Airports. There are no private airports or private airstrips within the City or in areas directly adjacent to the City. Therefore, 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 Response Plan. Although the proposed project would allow for the intensification, redistribution, and development of currently undeveloped parcels with higher-density development, future projects would be required to comply with policies set forth in the City's General Plan Public Safety Element (1975) related to emergency preparedness and evacuation procedures. Furthermore, since the planning area is generally built out, there are no properties adjacent to wildlands and there are no properties designated as being at risk for wildfires by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). In addition, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines,* and would also be required to comply with the City's General Plan Public Safety Element (1978). Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the impairment or interference with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. No impacts are anticipated.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Wildland Fires. In its existing setting, the planning area is almost entirely developed and is located in an urban area of Los Angeles County. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) publishes maps that predict the threat of fire in individual counties in the State; Local Responsibility Areas and State or Federal Responsibility Areas are classified as either very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZ) or non-VHFHSZ based on factors including fuel availability, topography, fire history, and climate. The project area is not located in or near a State Responsibility Area and does not include land classified as VHFHSZ as defined by CAL FIRE.

Although the proposed project would allow for the intensification, redistribution, and development of currently undeveloped or underdeveloped parcels with higher-density development, future projects would be required to comply with policies set forth in the City's General Plan Public Safety Element (1975) related to emergency preparedness and evacuation procedures. In addition, approval of the proposed LUE does not include any physical improvements that would result in the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Furthermore, since the planning area is generally built out, there are no properties adjacent to wildlands and there are no properties designated as being at risk for wildfires by CAL FIRE. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts related to emergency response activities or wildfire risks. Therefore, 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: Water Quality/Violation of Water Quality Standards. Although the proposed project would allow for the intensification, redistribution, and development of currently undeveloped parcels with higher-density development, approval of the proposed LUE does not include any physical improvements that would result in the alteration of existing drainage patterns or alterations to the course of a stream or river. Further, project implementation would not result in impacts related to the violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Although the proposed project would not include any physical improvements, the project would allow for future projects that could result in changes to impervious surfaces and drainage patterns on parcels proposed for development. As such, future developments located on properties over one acre in size would be required to obtain coverage under and comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. Project applicants would be required to provide the Waste Discharge Identification Number (WDID) to the City to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Construction General Permit. Pursuant to the requirements of the Construction General Permit and LU Policy 20-12 in the proposed LUE, each project over 1 acre in size would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implement Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce potential sources of pollutant discharges that could adversely impact water quality in the City and surrounding area during construction of the future projects. In addition, all future projects that disturb soil would be required to submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan to the City for review and approval (required by LU Policy 20-12), which would identify BMPs to reduce construction-related pollutants. Therefore, construction activities of future projects would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

In addition, future applicants of new development or redevelopment projects (unless exempt) would be required to submit a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) and a Low Impact Development (LID) Plan (LU Policy 20-12). These plans would identify BMPs to be implemented during operation to control stormwater pollutants and runoff to minimize impacts related to the violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Furthermore, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the violation of water quality standards and/or waste discharge requirements. No impacts are anticipated.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Groundwater. According to the *Long Beach Water 2015 Urban Water Management Plan* (adopted June 2, 2016), groundwater supply for the City is considered to be very reliable, even during multi-year droughts because extractions are strictly limited and because multiple forms of replenishment exist (e.g., recycled water is mixed with imported water and/or natural runoff and is allowed to percolate in the groundwater basin, and San Gabriel River stream flows are used to replenish

the groundwater basin, etc.). However, depending on the depth to groundwater and the depth of excavation, groundwater may be encountered during construction of future projects, and groundwater dewatering may be required. Future projects requiring groundwater dewatering activities during construction would be required to comply with LU Policy 20-12, which requires that applicants obtain coverage under and comply with the provisions of the Groundwater Discharge Permit. Project applicants would be required to provide the WDID to the City to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Groundwater Discharge Permit. Pursuant to the requirements of the Groundwater Discharge Permit, dewatered groundwater would be tested and treated (as necessary) prior to release into surface waters so violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would not occur. In addition, in most cases, the duration of groundwater dewatering and the volume of groundwater extracted during construction would be small in volume compared to the overall size of the groundwater basin and would not result in the substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.

As stated above, groundwater supply for the City is considered to be very reliable, even during multi-year droughts because extractions are strictly limited and because multiple forms of replenishment exist. In addition, because the proposed project places an emphasis on infill development projects on parcels that are currently paved and/or developed, the project would not substantially increase impervious surface areas in a manner that would substantially decrease infiltration. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Furthermore, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge such there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table. No impacts are anticipated.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Drainage and Runoff. The proposed project places an emphasis on infill development projects that would be concentrated along transit corridors throughout the City and on parcels that are currently paved and/or developed. As such, a majority of new projects facilitated by approval of the proposed project would be located in existing urban areas and would not result in impacts associated with substantial amounts of impervious surfaces. In addition, future applicants of new development or redevelopment projects (unless exempt) would be required to submit a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) and a Low Impact Development (LID) Plan (LU Policy 20-12). These plans would identify BMPs to be implemented during operation to control stormwater pollutants and runoff to minimize impacts related to the alteration of existing drainage patterns. Further, because a majority of future projects would occur on already paved and developed sites, operational BMPs would be implemented where treatment BMPs likely currently do not exist, which would improve stormwater quality discharges from those sites. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts associated with the violation of water quality standards and/or waste discharge requirements or with the alteration of a stream or river or drainage patterns. Furthermore, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the alteration of drainage patterns, the alteration of the course of a stream or river, and/or the generation of stormwater runoff. No impacts are anticipated.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Flooding. According to Figure LU-1 in the proposed LUE, most of the City is located in areas that are not within Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year flood zones, with the exception of areas near the Port of Long Beach, Downtown, and Naples Island. As such, the proposed LUE includes LU Policy 20-12, which requires future applicants to obtain

development permits from the City's Floodplain Administrator for projects proposed in FEMA special flood hazard areas to minimize flooding impacts to people and structures. Furthermore, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in flooding impacts due to the placement of housing within a 100-year flood zone or flooding impacts as a result of the failure of a levee and/or a dam. No impacts are anticipated.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Inundation. According to the City's Seismic Safety Element (1988) and the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA), the majority of the City is not located within a zone of seiche areas. Similarly, the majority of the City is located outside of the Tsunami Inundation Zone, with the exception of the Port of Long Beach and in areas along the coastline and Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers. However, in the event of a tsunami, the City has established response procedures as described in the City of Long Beach Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan. Furthermore, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in inundation impacts resulting from a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No impacts are anticipated.

Land Use: Divide an Established Community. The proposed project would establish PlaceTypes through the City that would guide future growth in the City while allowing for greater land use flexibility and cohesion throughout the City. The proposed project would also establish goals, policies, and implementation strategies aimed at providing buffer zones between incompatible uses. While the proposed project would establish PlaceTypes in the place of traditional land use designations to allow for the intensification, redistribution, and development of currently underdeveloped parcels with higher-density development, the project is also a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would divide an established community. Future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the division of an existing established community. No impacts are anticipated.

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 proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of a State. Further, the proposed LUE aims to transition heavy industrial uses, including uses targeting oil extraction, to green industrial activities and/or natural green areas and park uses (LU Policy 7-3 and LU Policy 20- 6). Future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the loss of mineral resources. No impacts are anticipated.

Noise: Located within an Airport Land Use Plan or within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip. The proposed project would establish the Regional-Serving Facility PlaceType adjacent to the Long Beach Airport. Allowable uses within this PlaceType include medical centers, higher education campuses, public utility facilities, destination retail centers, and other similar uses. While the project would allow for such uses within this PlaceType, the proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in the exposure of people or workers to excessive noise levels generated from the Long Beach Airport. Furthermore, future individual projects resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the excessive generation of noise for people residing or working near the Long Beach Airport. Additionally, there are no private airports located within or adjacent to the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the exposure of people working or residing near a private airport to excessive noise levels. No impacts are anticipated.

Noise: Excessive noise levels from a public airport or private air strip. The proposed project would not locate any new development within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The Long Beach Airport is located centrally within the City, approximately 3 miles northeast of the Downtown area. Implementation of the proposed project would locate business parks and airport-related land uses surrounding the Long Beach Airport and would not introduce any new noise-sensitive receptors within the 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) noise contour of the Long Beach Airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels from aircraft noise sources. No impacts are anticipated.

Population and Housing: Displace a Substantial Number of People or Housing Units. The proposed project includes the establishment of PlaceTypes in place of that would replace traditional land use designations. These PlaceTypes would guide future development patterns throughout the City through the year 2040. The proposed project would assume existing land uses would remain in place and future land use changes would occur through voluntary means or as a result of infill efforts throughout the duration of the planning period. The proposed project would also allow for mixed uses within most of the PlaceTypes, thereby increasing the number of available housing units throughout the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of people or housing units in the City, and would not necessitate replacement housing for such individuals. No impacts are anticipated.

Public Services: Parks. The proposed project would establish the Open Space PlaceType, which allows for the continued operation of existing parks in the City and encourages the creation of new parks and open space throughout the City. The Open Space PlaceType would also allow for park uses within several of the PlaceTypes to allow for an equitable distribution of parks available to residents and visitors in the City. Furthermore, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new park facilities. No impacts are anticipated.

Recreation. The planning area currently contains 100 public parks with 25 community centers, 2 tennis centers, 5 municipal golf courses, and a marina system. Overall, the citywide total of recreation uses is approximately 2,750 acres. Although the number of acres of existing open space and recreational uses currently falls short of the City's goal of providing 8 acres per 1,000 residents (as established in the 2002 General Plan Open Space Element), the proposed project aims to create additional open space and recreational uses to meet this goal. Specifically, the proposed LUE would establish the Open Space

PlaceType that would preserve existing parks and recreational facilities, while also creating additional parks and urban open spaces to increase connectivity between these resources and surrounding neighborhoods. In addition, one of the primary goals of the proposed LUE is to "create, restore, and preserve open space" uses in the City, including parks and recreation uses. For example, LU Policy 18-7 calls for prioritizing the location of new parks in underserved or low-income communities with the lowest ratio of park space per thousand residents.

Additionally, the City's General Plan Open Space Element would remain an adopted element of the General Plan and would be unaffected by approval of the proposed project. The City will continue to pursue open space goals and a policy as set forth in the Open Space Element, which itself is consistent with the LUE and the UDE. Furthermore, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in physical improvements that would generate an increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities nor would the project result in impacts related to the increased use and/or deterioration of recreational facilities. No impacts are anticipated.

Transportation: Hazard due to a Design Feature. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include the physical development of any project that would substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. The proposed project also establishes land use compatibility strategies for each PlaceType to reduce the potential for land use incompatibilities following project implementation. Furthermore, future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, 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). No impacts are anticipated.

Transportation: Inadequate Emergency Access. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include the physical development of any project that would propose or encourage development with inadequate emergency access. Future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines,* and individual site plans would be subject to review and approval by the Long Beach Police Department (LBPD) and the Long Beach Fire Department (LBFD) to ensure that adequate emergency access would be provided. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to inadequate emergency access. No impacts are anticipated.

Utilities/Service Systems: Comply with Regulations Related to Solid Waste. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include the physical development of any project that could result in the generation of solid waste. However, future new development facilitated by approval of the proposed LUE would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Furthermore, Section 18.67.070, Compliance with the WMP, of the City's Municipal Code requires that all new projects requiring demolition recycle, reuse, or divert 60 percent of construction waste from landfills to disposal sites. All future developments facilitated by project approval would continue to be subject to the appropriate planning and permitting processes, thereby ensuring compliance with applicable waste laws and regulations. Future individual projects requiring discretionary actions resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines,* and would be required to comply with existing and future statutes and regulations mandated by City, State, or federal law. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in conflicts with any adopted regulations related to solid waste. No impacts are anticipated.

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

The Final Recirculated 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 City-designated scenic viewpoints or scenic corridors in the City. However, the City's existing Open Space Element requires protection of scenic features in the City, including beaches, bluffs, wetlands, and water bodies. Due to the prominence of existing urban and industrial developments adjacent to the Pacific Ocean and the Port of Long Beach, views of these resources would not be significantly altered by development envisioned under the proposed project. Further, future development facilitated by project approval would be designed according to the development strategies, policies, and standards in the proposed Urban Design Element (UDE) and would be subject to height and density/intensity limitations for each PlaceType as outlined in the proposed Land Use Element (LUE). The proposed UDE also includes development strategies and policies that consider the context of existing scenic vistas and neighborhoods when designing and implementing projects. Although future development facilitated by project approval would modify views to and from areas throughout the City, such as potentially blocking distant views of the San Gabriel Mountains from public vantage points, project applicants would be required to demonstrate consistency with goals, policies, and strategies outlined in the proposed LUE and UDE that are aimed at preserving scenic vistas in the planning area. Therefore, potential impacts of the proposed project on scenic vistas would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Impact: Conflict with Applicable Zoning and Other Regulations Governing Scenic Quality. The visual character and quality of the planning area would be preserved and enhanced through the application of goals, policies, strategies, and development standards outlined in the LUE and UDE that are intended to guide the quality and aesthetic value of existing and future development in the City. Future projects within the City would also be required to submit detailed plans to the City to ensure consistency with the City's design requirements (including those outlined in the proposed UDE) aimed at improving the visual character of the planning area. As such, project implementation would ensure that the majority of the planning area, including identified aesthetic resources and scenic vistas, would not be affected by future growth. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the visual character of the planning area or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality, and no mitigation would be required.

Impact: Create a new source of substantial light and glare that would affect day or nighttime views. Future development facilitated by the project would introduce new sources of light to the City that are typical of development projects. Future development projects would be required to comply with the design standards established in the proposed UDE and the City's Municipal Code. On-site landscaping proposed as part of new development projects would further reduce glare and would serve to screen light sources to reduce the visual impact of lighting from buildings and parking lots. The City would review site plans and architectural renderings for new projects with an emphasis on the presence of reflective materials and proposed lighting to minimize potential impacts related to light and glare, and propose mitigation, if necessary. Although future development would introduce new sources of light that would contribute to the light visible in the night sky and surrounding area, the planning area is located within a highly urbanized area that is currently characterized by significant nighttime lighting. Therefore, the proposed project's impact related to light and glare would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Impact: Result in cumulative aesthetic impacts. The cumulative aesthetic study area for the proposed project is the visual resource areas within the City's viewshed. The viewshed from the planning area includes vantage points with views of the Pacific Ocean, the Port of Long Beach, the Long Beach marinas, the San Gabriel Mountains, and the Santa Ana Mountains.

Future development facilitated by the proposed project would change the visual character of the planning area, specifically within the Major Areas of Change, as compared to existing conditions. However, the site design, landscaping, and architectural design of future projects would be required to be consistent with goals, policies, strategies, and development standards established by the proposed UDE, which are intended to avoid, reduce, offset, or otherwise minimize identified potential adverse impacts of the proposed project or provide significant benefits to the community and/or to the physical environment. Furthermore, development envisioned by the proposed project is intended to improve the overall visual character of the City through new development projects that would shape the urban environment of the City, while preserving existing development that defines its unique aesthetic character.

The proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare on the planning area as a result of future development projects facilitated by project approval. However, because the City is currently characterized as an urban environment with existing high levels of light pollution, light emitted by future development projects would not result in a cumulatively significant visual impact related to light and glare. Cumulative impacts are, therefore, considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Air Quality

Impact: Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Construction During Project Operation. It is possible that construction of residential units allowed under the plan would be underway while other units constructed under the plan are operational. Since the project is a programmatic level document and specific projects that would be developed under the plan are unknown at this time, the precise combination of emissions that would occur is unknown. However, in order to disclose a worst-case scenario, the Air Quality Impact Analysis (LSA 2019) included an analysis of average construction emissions along with the horizon year 2040 project emissions. It was determined that combined emissions would be below the significance threshold established by the SCAQMD for daily project emissions.

CO Hot-Spot Analysis. Under existing and future vehicle emission rates, a project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour—or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal air does not mix—in order to generate a significant CO impact. The anticipated General Plan build out would not produce the volume of traffic required to generate a CO hot spot. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in CO hot spots. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Impact: Create objectionable odors or dust affecting a substantial number of people. During construction activities, construction equipment exhaust and application of asphalt and architectural coatings would temporarily generate odors. Any construction-related odor emissions would be temporary and intermittent. Additionally, noxious odors would be confined to the immediate vicinity of the construction equipment and unlikely to affect a substantial number of people. In addition, by the time such emissions reached any sensitive receptor sites, they would be diluted to well below any level of air quality concern. Furthermore, short-term construction-related odors are expected to cease upon the drying or hardening of the odor-producing materials. Therefore, impacts associated with construction-generated odors are considered less than significant.

While odor sources are present within the City, the odor policies enforced by the SCAQMD, including Rule 402, and City of Long Beach Municipal Code Section 8.64.040, prohibit nuisance odors and identify enforcement measures to reduce odor impacts to nearby receptors. Therefore, impacts associated with objectionable odors would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Impact: Result in cumulative air quality impacts. Cumulative impacts with respect to the generation of odors affecting a substantial number of people would be less than significant following compliance with odor policies enforced by the SCAQMD (including Rule 402) and City of Long Beach Municipal Code Section 8.64.040. However, as noted further below, the project would result in significant unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts related to air emissions in exceedance of applicable standards.

Global Climate Change

Impact: Result in cumulative global climate change/greenhouse gas emission impacts.
Although the proposed project is expected to emit GHGs, the emission of GHGs by any single project into the atmosphere is not itself necessarily an adverse environmental effect. Rather, it is the increased accumulation of GHGs from more than one project and many sources in the atmosphere that may result in GHG impacts. The resultant climate change consequences of those emissions, including sea level rise, could cause adverse environmental effects.

The proposed project would result in a GHG emission profile that is lower than existing GHG emissions within the City. 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. Because the proposed project's impacts alone would not cause or significantly contribute to GCC, project-related CO_2e emissions and their contribution to global climate change impacts in the State of California would not make a significant contribution to cumulatively considerable global climate change emission impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant long-term cumulative impact on global climate change (including sea level rise).

While CEQA does not require an analysis of existing conditions on the environment, potential cumulative impacts with respect to sea level rise were considered for disclosure purposes. As outlined in the EIR, rising sea levels may affect the built environment, including coastal development such as buildings, roads, and infrastructure. However, future projects facilitated under the proposed project would be planned in consideration of the conditions at the time they are proposed and would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis during environmental review for their potential to be affected by the change in sea level resulting from global climate change.

Land Use

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

California Coastal Act. In accordance with the California Coastal Act (CCA), the proposed project aims to protect, maintain, and enhance the overall quality of the California Coastal Zone by preserving existing natural resources within the Coastal Zone. The proposed project also includes a number of other goals, policies, and strategies aimed at achieving compliance with goals outlined in the CCA. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable goals and policies outlined in the CCA.

Local Coastal Program: The proposed project would result in updates to the City's General Plan that would be inconsistent with portions of the City's existing Local Coastal Program (LCP). Therefore, updates/amendments to the City's LCP could be required at the time individual applications for development within the City's Coastal Zone are proposed, if they were determined by the City to be inconsistent with the adopted General Plan LUE. In addition, the proposed project includes Project Design Feature 4.4.1, which mandates a Zone Change Program and LCP update to ensure that changes facilitated by the adopted LUE are consistent with the Zoning Code and LCP.

SCAG 2008 RCP. The 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) aims to balance growth with conservation by focusing growth in existing centers and along major transportation corridors, encouraging mixed-use development, providing new housing opportunities, encouraging development near transportation stations to reduce congestion and air pollutants, preserving single-family neighborhoods, and protecting open space areas from development. The proposed project would adopt PlaceTypes, which would emphasize flexible land use patterns and would allow for a mix of compatible uses in areas throughout the City. The project would also allow for residential uses within several PlaceTypes, which would be consistent with the 2008 RCP's goals to preserve existing single-family neighborhoods while also providing additional housing opportunities in denser areas of the City. The project would also establish the Open Space PlaceType, which would be consistent with the 2008 RCP's goals to preserve existing single-family neighborhoods and protect open space and areas from development. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable goals outlined in the 2008 RCP.

SCAG RTP/SCS Consistency. The RTP/SCS includes goals to protect the environment and health of its residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation, provide new housing opportunities, and enable businesses to be profitable and competitive. The proposed project would promote mixed-use development adjacent to stations along existing bus routes and along the Metro Blue Line route. The project would also allow for mixed-use development in most of the proposed PlaceTypes and would focus on creating walkable, pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods that would reduce automobile dependence and improve the transportation network. The proposed project would also promote a variety of housing types by allowing for varying building densities within the proposed PlaceTypes. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the 2016–2040 RTP. Impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

General Plan, Specific Plan, Paleontological Mitigation Plan (PMP), and Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) Consistency: As part of the proposed LUE, the 14 PlaceTypes would replace the existing land use designations. Approval of the proposed project would result in the project being consistent with the General Plan and would ensure the proposed LUE would be the presiding policy document guiding land use in the City. The goals and policies in the General Plan would be updated and replaced by the goals, strategies, policies, and implementation strategies outlined in the proposed LUE and UDE. The proposed PlaceTypes would be consistent with adopted specific plans currently regulating development in the City. Similarly, the proposed project would allow for development within adopted airport land use plans to

continue to be regulated by such plans. The proposed project, once approved, would therefore be consistent with adopted land use plans. Impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

City Zoning Code: The proposed LUE would allow for increased densities, intensities, and heights throughout the City as compared to the existing General Plan and Zoning Code. While the PlaceTypes included as part of the project would be inconsistent with some current zoning districts and regulations outlined in the City's existing Zoning Code and corresponding Zoning Map, the project includes Project Design Feature 4.4.1 to address such inconsistencies. Additionally, the proposed UDE would also establish goals, policies, and implementation strategies aimed at guiding the desired urban form and character associated with each PlaceType included in the proposed LUE. Therefore, with incorporation of Project Design Feature 4.4.1, the proposed project would be consistent with the City's Zoning Code and Zoning Map.

Project Design Feature 4.4.1: To ensure that the proposed project complies with and would not conflict with or impede the City of Long Beach (City) Zoning Code, the project shall implement a Zone Change Program and Local Coastal Program (LCP) update to ensure that changes facilitated by the adopted Land Use Element (LUE) are consistent with the Zoning Code and LCP. The Zone Change Program and LCP update shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Director of Development Services, or designee, and shall include the following specific performance criteria to be implemented within 5 years from the date of project approval:

- **Year 1:** Within the first 12 months following project approval, all Land Use Element/Zoning Code/LCP inconsistencies shall be identified and mapped. The City shall evaluate these inconsistencies and prioritize areas needing intervention.
- **Year 2:** Following the identification and mapping of any zoning and LCP inconsistencies, the City shall, within 24 months following project approval, begin processing zone changes, zone text amendments, and LCP updates in batches, as required to ensure that the Zoning Code and LCP are consistent with the adopted LUE.
- **Year 3:** The City shall, within 36 months following project approval, begin drafting new zones, or begin preparation of a comprehensive Zoning Code and LCP update, to better reflect the PlaceTypes identified in the adopted LUE.
- **Year 5:** All zoning and LCP inconsistencies shall be resolved through mapping and text amendments by the end of the fifth year following project approval. The City shall also submit the updated LCP to the California Coastal Commission (CCC) for consideration and approval by the end of the fifth year following project approval.

Impact: Result in cumulative land use impacts. The cumulative impact area for land use for the proposed project is the City of Long Beach. Given that the proposed project encompasses a comprehensive update to the City's existing General Plan LUE and the adoption of a new UDE, the project itself would shape growth in the City through the horizon year 2040 and is therefore cumulative in nature. As such, each new development project facilitated by project approval and subject to discretionary review would be subject to its own General Plan consistency analysis and would be reviewed for consistency with adopted land use plans and policies.

Approval of the proposed project would ensure that the proposed LUE would become the guiding land use document for the City, thereby mitigating any potential inconsistencies with the City's General Plan and other applicable land use documents (i.e., the California Coastal Act, the City's LCP, and SCAG's

RCP and RTP/SCS). The project would also address potential inconsistencies with the City's Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map within the first 5 years following project approval (as outlined in Project Design Feature 4.4.1), which would reduce cumulative project impacts related to potential zoning inconsistencies to a less than significant level. No mitigation would be required.

Noise

Impact: Generate a substantial increase in noise levels in excess of standards established by the City of Long Beach or applicable standards of other agencies.

Long-Term Stationary-Source Noise Impacts. Development allowed under the proposed LUE may include the installation or creation of new stationary sources of noise, or could include the development of new sensitive land uses in the vicinity of existing noise sources. However, noise generation would continue to be limited by the Noise Ordinance of the City's Municipal Code (Chapter 8.80).

Implementation of the LUE is not anticipated to result in increased railroad operations within the City. However, the LUE proposes the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType, which would allow future multifamily developments to be located along the Metro Blue Line fixed rail route. Locating multifamily developments near the light-rail corridor could expose sensitive land uses to operational rail noise.

Several of the LUE and UDE policies require new development projects to incorporate site planning and project design strategies to separate or buffer neighborhoods from incompatible activities or land uses. Specifically Policy UD 26-2 requires new development projects to incorporate site planning and project design strategies to separate or buffer neighborhoods from incompatible activities or land uses and LU Policy 16-8 requires that all new developments in areas with noise levels greater than 60 dBA CNEL prepare an acoustical analysis. LU Policy 16-8 also requires new residential land uses to be designed to maintain a standard of 45 dBA Ldn or less in building interiors. Any new noise-generating sources would also be subject to compliance with Chapter 8.80, Noise, of the City's Municipal Code, which sets exterior noise standards for the various land uses within the City. Therefore, implementation of the project would not expose persons to noise levels in excess of the City's Municipal Code, and no mitigation measures are required.

Long-Term Traffic Noise Impacts. Potential sources of permanent increase in ambient noise include noise resulting from the project-related increase in traffic on roadways in the planning area. Based on traffic volumes outlined in the *Traffic Impact Analysis* (TIA) (LSA 2019) for the proposed project, it was determined that the project-related increase in traffic noise would approach 2.1 dBA for all segments, which is considered less than the threshold of perceptibility for humans (i.e., 3 dBA). Therefore, the implementation of the proposed project is not expected to result in the generation of substantial traffic noise increases, and no mitigation would be required.

Impact: Result in cumulative noise impacts-Long-Term Traffic Noise. The proposed project would not create a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional noise conditions. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a 3 dBA increase in traffic noise levels in the City and would not generate a significant impact under cumulative noise conditions. Additionally, implementation of the LUE/UDE policies and land use strategies would require the City to consider noise and land use compatibility issues when evaluating future individual development proposals. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact, and no mitigation would be required.

Population and Housing

Impact: Induce unplanned substantial population growth. A project could indirectly induce growth by reducing or removing barriers to growth or by creating a condition that attracts additional population or new economic activity. Typically, the growth-inducing potential of a project would be considered significant if it fosters growth or a concentration of population in excess of what is assumed in pertinent master plans, land use plans, or in projections made by regional planning agencies (e.g., SCAG). Significant growth impacts could also occur if the project provides infrastructure or service capacity to accommodate growth beyond the levels currently permitted by local or regional plans and policies. In general, growth induced by a project is considered a significant impact if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public utilities, or if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth significantly affects the environment in some other way.

The proposed project would allow for an increase in population, employment, and housing in the City of Long Beach through the horizon year 2040. With the exception of housing, this increase would be consistent with SCAG's regional growth forecasts for each of these areas for the same horizon year. However, much of the housing unit increase is expected to accommodate existing residents due to a combination of aging in place and overcrowded housing conditions, as identified in the City's AFH report. Therefore, the project's growth-inducing potential would be less than significant, as it would not foster growth in excess of what is already anticipated in pertinent master plans, land use plans, or in projections made by regional planning agencies (e.g., SCAG). Further, because the proposed project would facilitate an increase in non-residential uses, the proposed project is anticipated to meet any increased demands for additional goods and services associated with the projected increase in population.

In addition, improvements to public utilities, including new water, sanitary sewer, and storm water services would be identified through the development review process and through the city's capital improvement planning as new developments are proposed. Infrastructure improvements associated with future development facilitated by project approval would be sized appropriately for each project and would not be oversized to serve additional growth beyond that envisioned under the proposed LUE. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts with respect to the inducement of substantial unplanned population growth in an area. No mitigation would be required.

Impact: Result in cumulative population and housing impacts. The City's population and employment are anticipated to increase by 18,230 persons and 28,511 jobs by 2040. Project-related increases in population and employment have been accounted for in SCAG's growth projections for the City. As demonstrated by growth projections outlined in SCAG's 2016–2040 RTP, demographic growth is anticipated to occur in the planning area regardless of the proposed LUE; however, the proposed LUE would affect the distribution of projected demographic growth. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in cumulative population or employment increases that would exceed projected regional forecasts for the City.

Approval of the proposed project would allow for the future development of a variety of uses that would serve to provide a sound and diversified economic base and ample employment opportunities for the citizens of Long Beach. Furthermore, the proposed project will serve an existing demand for employment, while also meeting the cumulative demand of employment that will result from the City's projected future population. With the exception of housing, project-related increases in population and employment would be within the total projected growth forecasts for 2040 established in the Final 2016–2040 RTP. The increase in housing above what is projected in the 2016–2040 is required to alleviate existing overcrowding conditions as identified in the AFH, as well as meet the City's affordable housing requirements under the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). As such, housing growth envisioned under the proposed project would not significantly induce growth within the planning area. In addition, implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with the City's vision for the

community and State housing requirements. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively significant population or housing impact and the future development facilitated by project approval would not significantly induce growth in areas where growth was not previously anticipated. No mitigation would be required.

Public Services

Impact: Result in substantial impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection. As a result of increased growth accommodated by the proposed project, overall demands for fire protection services and emergency services in the City would increase. Consequently, additional Long Beach Fire Department (LBFD) resources (including staffing) would be required to provide fire protection for new residents, workers, and structures. The City's costs to maintain facilities and equipment as well as train and equip personnel would also increase. The costs of additional personnel and materials are anticipated to be offset through the increased revenues and fees, such as property taxes, generated by future development. Future projects would be reviewed by the City on a project-by-project basis and would need to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted. Prior to the issuance of building permits, future project applicants would be required to pay the adopted police facilities impact fees. The LBFD would also continue to be supported by Proposition H revenue; the City's General Funds; the City's Tidelands operation revenue; and other revenue sources. Therefore, sufficient revenue would be available for necessary improvements to provide for adequate fire facilities, equipment, and personnel upon the anticipated General Plan build out. Additionally, the proposed PlaceType designations would permit the future development and operation of new stations within these PlaceTypes. The proposed project permits development of new stations, proposes no physical improvements, and requires all future projects to assess project impacts on fire protection services. Furthermore, any future expansion of fire facilities or new facilities requiring discretionary review would be subject to environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines,* and would be subject to the same mitigation measures applicable to all developments tiering off this Final Recirculated EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in substantial impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection. The proposed project does not include any physical improvements, but allows future development that is anticipated to create an increase in the typical range of police service calls within the City. New and/or additional police resources would be needed to prevent an impact to service ratios as a result of future growth accommodated by the project. The City's costs to maintain facilities and equipment as well as train and equip personnel would also increase. The costs of additional personnel and materials are anticipated to be offset through the increased revenues and fees, such as property taxes, generated by future development. Future projects would be reviewed by the City on a project-by-project basis and would need to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted. Prior to the issuance of building permits, future project applicants would be required to pay the adopted police facilities impact fees. Additional police personnel and resources would be provided through the annual budget review process. Furthermore, the Long Beach Police Department (LBPD) would continue to be supported by Proposition H revenue, a per barrel tax on all oil producers in Long Beach; the City's Tidelands operation revenue; and other revenue sources. By following this process, sufficient revenue would be available for necessary service improvements to provide for adequate police facilities, equipment, and personnel under the anticipated General Plan build out. Furthermore, any future expansion of fire facilities or new facilities requiring discretionary review would be subject to environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines,* and would be subject to the same mitigation measures applicable to all developments tiering

off this Final Recirculated EIR. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in substantial impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for public schools. Implementation of the proposed project would allow for the future development of up to 28,524 dwelling units by 2040, which would result in the generation of additional school-age children within the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) service area. Of the 28,524 units, the City has identified a need for 21,476 housing units to address existing housing needs attributed to overcrowding. As such, the majority of the 28,524 anticipated new housing units would serve to relieve overcrowding of existing households in the City, so those families are already being served by LBUSD. Still, this potential future growth could strain existing and/or planned school facilities.

Based on student generation factors and projected growth in the City, it was determined that the anticipated General Plan build out would result in an increase in 5,272 students. With the anticipated General Plan build out, elementary and middle school enrollment in LBUSD would be within the 2017–2018 LBUSD facilities capacity, but the total estimated enrollment for high schools in 2040 could exceed the LBUSD current facilities' capacity. All future development projects in the City would be required to pay school developer fees to LBUSD for the operation, maintenance, and development of schools to accommodate future student enrollment. If student growth generated by the anticipated General Plan build out exceeds the estimates identified above, the acquisition, modernization, or modification of school sites to accommodate additional facilities could be required. Additional school resources would also continue to be funded by an increase in tax revenue as a result of future growth. In addition, new housing units would be built over the course of 21 years, during which enrollment rates would likely fluctuate. Therefore, impacts of the proposed project related to student generation and the potential need for additional school facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Impact: Result in substantial impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for other public facilities.

Public Libraries. The proposed project does not include any physical improvements but would allow for new PlaceTypes that would facilitate an increase in housing units in the City and could increase the demand for library facilities. Demand for library services is typically determined based on the size of the resident population. The City has not formally adopted a service standard of library space per capita, but the City did establish a target of 0.45 square feet (sf) per capita in its budget for Fiscal Year 2007. Using this standard and the estimated future population of approximately 484,485, the Long Beach Public Library System (LBPL) would need to contain a total of 218,019[1] sf to meet this target. In total, the existing LBPL system has approximately 237,695 sf of library facilities, which is greater than the City's threshold for providing library services for both the existing population and the projected demand generated by the anticipated build out of the General Plan. In addition, technology continues to evolve as does resident demand for library services and resources. With the increased demand for electronic resources, it may be valuable to measure library services by more than a square footage per capita benchmark. For example, the City is replacing the Main Library with a new library at the City's Civic Center. Although this library is smaller in square footage than the original library, the new library makes more efficient use of its space. It also contains more electronic resources and requires less space to accommodate hardcopy library materials. Therefore, the loss of library square footage is not considered a loss of library volumes or available resources to serve the existing and projected population in the City. It

[1] 0.45 square feet per the City's population of 484,485 in 2040.

is anticipated that the demand for electronic materials will continue to increase, potentially reducing the amount of square footage to service library patrons. The proposed project's increase in demand on library services can be served by the existing facilities and would not adversely affect library services in the project area. As such, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts related to public libraries, and no mitigation would be required.

Impact: Result in cumulative public services impacts.

Fire Protection. The proposed project would contribute to cumulative local and regional demand for fire services. Each future project requiring a discretionary action within the City would be evaluated individually, and project-specific mitigation would be proposed as needed. The costs of additional LBFD resources are anticipated to be offset through increased revenues and fees, such as property taxes and Fire Facilities Impact Fees, generated by future development. The City is almost entirely built out, with most new development occurring as in-fill projects. The LBFD anticipates cumulative demand in order to plan for overall service. This cumulative demand is anticipated to be met through project implementation as the LUE establishes the development of future fire stations. Furthermore, through implementation of the proposed project, the City will reduce the potential for dangerous fires by concentrating development within urban areas where there is a low fire risk and by requiring that future projects, including those that would replace older outdated buildings, comply with applicable City and State regulations related to fire. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to fire protection impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation would be required.

Police Protection. The City is almost entirely built out, with most new development occurring as in-fill projects. The cumulative demand for police protection services is anticipated to be met through project implementation, as the LUE establishes the development of future police stations. In addition, the need for additional law enforcement associated with cumulative growth would be addressed through the annual budgeting process when budget adjustments would be made in an effort to meet changes in service demand. Police facility impact fees would also be required for new residential and nonresidential development to offset additional costs of new development. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to police protection impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation would be required.

Public Schools. The proposed project would generate approximately 5,272 school-aged children, which would lead to an increased demand on existing educational school facilities. Future projects consistent with the LUE would be accounted for on a project-by-project basis. Residential projects located within the LBUSD service area, but outside the City, would have the potential to generate school-aged children, and, as a result, increase demand on educational school facilities. LBUSD would assess developer fees to future projects within its service area in an effort to fund future schools needed to meet the project-related increase in school-aged children. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative school impacts, and no mitigation is required.

Public Libraries. The City currently meets the LBPL system's square footage requirements, and the proposed project would not exceed the LBPL system's ability to meet the anticipated General Plan build out for library services. Further, the City has replaced older less-efficient library buildings with newer facilities with more electronic resources and library materials. As the demand for electronic resources continues to increase, less square footage is required for library facilities. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to library impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation is required.

Transportation

Impact: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

Congestion Management Program Transit. Long Beach is served by a robust transit network. The proposed project increases density of land uses adjacent to transit corridors to leverage the existing transit infrastructure and potentially reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions.

Based on the guidance provided in the Los Angeles County CMP, it is estimated that 7 percent of residential person-trips and 9 percent of commercial person-trips in the Downtown PlaceType (within 0.25 mile of the Transit Gallery multi-modal transportation corridor), 5 percent of residential person-trips and 7 percent of commercial person-trips in the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType (within 0.25 mile of the Blue Line, a CMP transit corridor), and 3.5 percent of all other person-trips would be transit trips.

For residential and commercial person-trip data, this analysis uses population and employment data respectively. The data developed for the anticipated General Plan Build Out (2040) With Proposed Land Use Plan scenario estimated that the population in the Downtown PlaceType would increase by 3,190 while employment would increase by 5,200. Transit-Oriented Development PlaceTypes will have a population increase of 7,448 and an employment increase of 268. The population increase for all other areas of Long Beach is 7,592, and the employment increase of all other areas is 23,043. To avoid double counting, 22 percent of the total 18,230 population change was estimated to both live and work in Long Beach, which is the existing percentage.

The estimated percentage of transit trips and estimated person-trips described above result in an estimated new transit ridership of 2,014 during the single busiest morning peak hour and 2,014 during the single busiest evening peak hour by 2040. Morning and evening commute periods last for multiple hours, but the transit ridership during the remainder of the peak commute periods (as well as midday and late evening) would be lower than this single hour transit demand. The busiest hour transit demand would be spread across the Blue Line, 34 fixed routes operated by Long Beach Transit (LBT), and other transit operators in Long Beach. On average, each route would experience an increase of approximately 50 riders during the peak hours, which is unlikely to create an impact to the existing and future transit service. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Impact: Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b). The 2016 SCAG RTP/SCS provided calculations of VMT derived from the Regional Travel Demand Model. VMT per capita is anticipated to decline in the future as a result of previous planning efforts and is anticipated to decline further due to the elements of the 2016 SCAG RTP/SCS. VMT per capita in Long Beach is lower in the existing condition than the region as a whole or in Los Angeles County. With implementation of the 2016 RTP/SCS, VMT per capita in Long Beach is anticipated to still be lower than the region as a whole or in Los Angeles County.

Similar to the trend shown in the 2016 RTP/SCS, VMT in Long Beach is projected to decline as a result of planning efforts. In absolute terms, VMT in Long Beach would be reduced from 9,482,252 per day in the existing condition to 9,028,327 with the proposed project (a 5 percent decrease). The population will increase as VMT declines, resulting in VMT per capita declining from 19.9 per day to 18.2 per day (a 9 percent decrease).

Land use changes proposed in the LUE/UDE result in more efficient travel during the morning and evening peak commute hours (i.e., lower VMT during the peak periods). However, VMT during off-peak times increases slightly with the LUE/UDE as compared to the existing LUE. These off-peak VMT are generated by discretionary trips associated with the number of households in the City. Because the project

reduces overcrowding compared to the previous land use distribution, the number of discretionary trips increases as does the off-peak VMT and, subsequently, the total VMT, compared to the no project scenario. The existing VMT per household is 56.9 per day, which is anticipated to decline in the future to 49.9 per day without the project. The efficiency of the distribution of land uses in the LUE/UDE would reduce this further to 46.1 VMT per day per household (a 19 percent decrease from existing conditions).

The State of California has concurrent goals of reducing VMT and increasing housing supply to improve affordability and reduce overcrowding. The proposed project increases the number of housing units to reduce overcrowding in Long Beach. The efficiency of the location of land uses in the project (i.e., infill development policies and sites) results in a 19 percent decrease in VMT per household compared to existing conditions. Other measures of VMT, including per capita and absolute terms, decline as well, compared to existing conditions. With the project, VMT per capita in Long Beach remains lower than the region as a whole and lower than Los Angeles County. Because the measures of VMT in absolute terms and per capita decrease from existing conditions with the project and the measure of VMT per household decreases from existing conditions and from the current LUE, it is determined that the project would have a less than significant impact related to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.3 subdivision (b). No mitigation is required.

Utilities

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

- **Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities causing adverse environmental impacts;**
- **Lack of sufficient water supply to server future demand during normal, dry and multiple dry years**

Although the proposed project does not include any physical improvements or development, future development projects facilitated by the proposed project's approval would result in an increased water demand. The project-related increase in water demand in 2040 would be 59,105 acre-feet, or less than one percent of the Long Beach Water Department's (LBWD) total projected water supply for the horizon year 2040. As such, water supplies will be sufficient to meet all demands through the horizon year 2040 during normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year hydrologic conditions. It should also be noted that the project-related increase in demand for water may not directly correlate with the increase in housing units since the majority of anticipated new units is needed to alleviate overcrowding of existing residences that are already using water.

The proposed project would comply with water conservation measures, including pertinent provisions of CALGreen Code building efficiency standards (Title 24, Part 11) regarding the use of water-efficient fixtures. Policies and programs outlined in the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) and the proposed LUE would reduce water consumption and wastewater flow during operation, which will decrease the overall burden on existing water facilities and decrease the number of facilities that would need to be constructed or expanded. Additionally, under AB 610, a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) would be required for certain projects. Individual projects occurring under the proposed project would be required to prepare a WSA if they meet any of the requirements under AB 610. Because future development that may occur with implementation of the proposed project has been determined to be consistent with water demands in the 2015 UWMP and because the LBWD has identified a surplus water supply to serve the projected water demands through the horizon year 2040, the future project-related demand for water would be consistent with the City's UWMP. Therefore, the proposed project would not

result in the need for additional water infrastructure that would result in a significant impact. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

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

- **Require or result in construction of new wastewater facilities or the expansion of existing facilities**
- **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**

Short-term demand for wastewater treatment services may occur during construction activities associated with future projects facilitated by approval of the proposed project. Sanitary services during construction of future projects would likely be provided by portable toilet facilities, which would transport waste off site for treatment and disposal. The demand for wastewater treatment services during construction would be temporary and would generate minimal wastewater compared to the demand for wastewater treatment services associated with the anticipated General Plan build out scenario. Therefore, construction activities are expected to result in less than significant impacts on the wastewater treatment and collection system, and no mitigation would be required.

Following the anticipated General Plan build out, the estimated wastewater flow would be approximately 43 million gallons per day (mgd), which would represent approximately 4 percent of the remaining capacity of existing County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (LACSD) facilities. This projection is anticipated to be conservative and representative of a "worst-case scenario" because the majority of new housing units to be developed as part of the project are required to alleviate overcrowding of existing housing units with current Long Beach residents who are already generating wastewater. In addition, new units are likely to use significantly less water and thereby generate less wastewater due to building codes requiring reduced water consumption and reduced landscaping associated with proposed multi-family residential units, which account for the majority of new residential development under the proposed project. Therefore, the projected future increase in wastewater flows associated with development that may occur with implementation of the proposed project would not exceed the treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) for the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) and the Long Beach Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) of the LACSD.

Future development projects facilitated by project approval would be reviewed by the City on a project-by-project basis and would be required to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted, including sewer capacity considerations as part of the City development review and approval process. Improvements and upgrades to sewer lines would continue to be prioritized based on need and would occur throughout the planning period.

Project impacts related to wastewater treatment would be less than significant. In addition, project implementation would not necessitate the construction of wastewater supply or conveyance facilities. No mitigation would be required.

Impact: Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with the provisions of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit), or any other subsequent applicable permits. The Construction

General Permit requires preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to identify construction BMPs in order to reduce impacts to water quality, including those impacts associated with soil erosion, siltation, spills, and increased runoff. Furthermore, as future individual projects are proposed, the City would review grading plans and construction documents to identify project features aimed at reducing construction impacts to storm drain facilities. Where necessary, the City would identify project conditions to ensure the adequate capacity and operation of the storm drain system during construction activities. Therefore, construction activities associated with implementation of the project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new stormwater drainage systems, where the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts.

Development of future projects could increase impervious surface area, which could reduce infiltration and increase runoff. Future projects would be reviewed on a project-by-project basis and would need to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted, including payment of Development Fees to fund future improvements to the City's stormwater infrastructure. Such improvements are outlined in the City's 2019 Capital Improvement Program and include upgrades related to storm drain pipelines, pump stations, and stormwater monitoring equipment.

Depending on the size and nature of the projects, a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) would be developed to address post-construction urban runoff and stormwater pollution from new development and significant redevelopment projects. Future projects would also be required to comply with goals and policies outlined in the proposed LUE that are aimed at reducing stormwater runoff and mitigating off-site impacts related to pollutants entering natural water bodies. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities, and no mitigation would be required.

Impact: Require or result in in construction of new telecommunication facilities or the expansion of existing telecommunications facilities. Construction activities associated with future projects would not increase the demand for telecommunications facilities, and thus would not require or result in the construction of new or the relocation of existing telecommunication facilities. However, future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in the need for new or relocated telecommunications facilities. Similar to existing market conditions, Spectrum Communications, Frontier Communications, and AT&T U-Verse would extend existing services to meet the increased demand for telephone, internet, and cable services as future developments are proposed. Where necessary, infrastructure improvements would be made to existing telecommunications facilities in order to meet customer demands. Environmental impacts associated with future improvements to telecommunications facilities are anticipated to be minimal, as these facility areas would have previously been disturbed through association with past infrastructure improvements. In addition, any major improvements to telecommunications facilities would be reviewed on a project-by-project basis, and would comply with any applicable regulations in place at the time such development is proposed. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the construction or relocation of existing telecommunications facilities, and no mitigation would be required.

Impact: Solid waste in excess of State or local standards, local infrastructure, or impairing attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Construction of future projects facilitated by the proposed project would generate demolition waste. Construction waste would be recycled pursuant to Chapter 18.67, Construction and Demolition Recycling Program, of the City's Municipal Code. Under the Municipal Code, projects requiring demolition or building permits are required to divert at least 60 percent of all construction and demolition material from landfills. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to solid waste generation during construction, and no mitigation measures regarding construction debris are required.

Solid waste generated by operations associated with future development under the proposed project would be collected by the City's Environmental Services Bureau and hauled to the Southeast Resource Recovery Facility (SERRF). With the proposed project, the City is forecast to generate approximately 1.62 million pounds of solid waste in 2040, or an increase of approximately 193,744 pounds (lbs) per day. There is sufficient landfill capacity in the region to serve solid waste generated by the proposed project. In addition, all future projects facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts related to solid waste generation would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Impact: Result in cumulatively impacts to utilities/service systems. The proposed project would contribute to cumulative local and regional demand for utilities/service systems, including wastewater, water, and solid waste. For each service system, the proposed project would generate increased demand in varying amounts. However, each future project within the project area would be evaluated individually, and project-specific mitigation would be required as needed. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to utilities/service systems would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Wastewater. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis for wastewater treatment is defined as the City and LACSD. The future anticipated General Plan build out is not anticipated to generate wastewater above LACSD's current capacity. However, compliance with applicable federal and State regulations along with specific jurisdictional ordinances, as well as further CEQA review for projects requiring discretionary approvals, would reduce cumulative impacts related to potential wastewater treatment violations to a less than significant level. The proposed project would result in a population consistent with the growth projections for the City provided in the SCAG 2016–2040 RTP/SCS. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to wastewater generation in the LACSD service area would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation is required.

Water. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of water infrastructure includes the service territory of the LBWD. According to the City's 2015 UWMP, future water supplies are reliable through the horizon year (2040) of the project. In addition, LBWD projects that there are sufficient groundwater supplies to meet any future demand requirements in the City. Further, the current 2015 UWMP accounts for the proposed project's transition from traditional land uses to PlaceTypes and has demonstrated that the LBWD has the ability to serve the project-related increase in water demand through the horizon year 2040. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to water demand would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Solid Waste. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of impacts to solid waste disposal capacity is the County of Los Angeles. Development associated with the proposed project and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within the County would contribute to an increase in demand for landfill capacity and solid waste services for the County. As stated previously, the SERRF, a refuse-to-energy transformation facility, serves the planning area and does not have a scheduled closure date. It is expected that the SERRF will continue to operate at its current permitted daily capacity through 2027. The SERRF currently does not exceed its daily maximum permitted disposal capacity. Solid waste considered unprocessable by SERRF would be taken to landfills in Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties. There is currently sufficient permitted capacity within the LACSD system serving Los Angeles County to provide adequate future capacity for the County's solid waste needs. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively significant impact on waste disposal capacity at LACSD facilities.

Telecommunications. The geographic area for cumulative analysis of cable, telephone, and internet services consists of the service territory for Spectrum Communications, Frontier Communications, and AT&T U-Verse. These services are not operating above capacity; however, these service providers are anticipated to extend current facilities to meet project service demands on an as-needed basis, as is the

case under existing market conditions. Therefore, the proposed project's impacts related to cable, telephone, and internet services would not be cumulatively significant. No mitigation would be required.

Energy

Impact: Project to result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during construction or operation.
The proposed project would contribute to use of energy resources during construction and operation, including use of electricity, natural gas and gasoline. However, as noted below, these resources would not be used in a wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary manner. No mitigation is required.

Electricity. Energy would be consumed throughout construction and operation associated with future projects facilitated through approval of the proposed project. Energy would be required during construction for the transportation of building materials, manufacturing of building materials, and the actual construction of buildings and infrastructure improvements. Energy consumption during operation would be associated with building heating and cooling, use of consumer products, lighting, and vehicular traffic.

The projected electricity demand in the City would be 1,950,216,130 kilowatt hours (kWh) in 2040 (approximately 117.18 percent greater than the existing electricity demand). However, many of the land uses as proposed under the project would replace existing uses that already utilize electricity resources. Furthermore, energy efficiency technologies would continue to improve through the life of the project (horizon year 2040). New facilities required to support the project-related demand for electricity would be constructed in accordance with the demand for the new service. Potential environmental impacts would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. However, because the City is largely built out, it is not anticipated that major new facilities would be necessary to serve new development facilitated by project approval at the horizon year of the General Plan build out (2040). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Natural Gas. Future development occurring under the proposed project would generate a natural gas demand of 4,649,160,730 kBtu, or an approximately 16.34 percent increase in natural gas demand. This analysis assumes the full anticipated General Plan build out, which is a worst-case analysis, since it is unknown how much of the proposed residential and non-residential uses would actually be constructed. In addition, many of the land uses as proposed under the project would replace existing uses that already utilize natural gas resources.

Gas service will be added to the existing system operated and maintained by the Long Beach Energy Resources (ER) Department, as necessary, to meet the requirements of individual projects within the City. Because developments that would be considered under the proposed project have not yet been designed or proposed, the specific improvements to existing natural gas facilities that would need to be implemented to serve future developments are unknown at this time, as are the potential environmental impacts of such improvements. Potential environmental impacts would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. However, because the City is largely built out, it is not anticipated that major improvements would be necessary to serve the City and new development facilitated by the project approval. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Gasoline. From 2018 to 2040, VMT per capita would decrease by approximately 9 percent, from 19.9 in 2018 to 18.2 in 2040, and VMT per household would decrease by 19 percent from 56.9 in 2018 to 46.1 in 2040. The decrease in VMT per capita and per household would likely result in an associated decrease in the demand for gasoline. Moreover, the fuel efficiency of vehicles is expected to continue to increase and improve throughout the life of the project as new fuel economy standards are established.

Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in transportation-related energy uses, such that it would result in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Impact: conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Future projects facilitated by approval of the proposed project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code building efficiency standards (Title 24, Part 11) and the California Energy Code Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6), which includes provisions related to insulation and design aimed at minimizing energy consumption. Future projects facilitated by project approval would also be required to comply with goals, policies, and strategies outlined in the proposed LUE and UDE that are aimed at reducing energy consumption in the planning area. These goals, policies, and strategies have been developed in accordance with federal and State energy regulations, such as CALGreen Code building efficiency standards (Title 24, Part 11), the California Energy Code Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6),and SB 743, which are also aimed at reducing energy consumption. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable plans related to renewable energy and energy efficiency, and no mitigation would be required.

Impact: Cumulative Energy Impacts. Cumulative energy impacts are found to be less than significant.

Electricity. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of impacts to the provision of electricity is the service territory of Southern California Edison (SCE). The anticipated General Plan build out scenario (2040) would represent approximately 1.3 percent of the extrapolated 2040 peak demand. SCE has identified adequate capacity to handle an 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. Therefore, it is anticipated that the electricity demand under the anticipated General Plan build out scenario (2040) would be within the forecasted electricity demand for the 2040 build out. The proposed project's 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 Energy Resources (ER) Department. The anticipated 2040 natural gas demand would represent 0.05 percent of the ER Department's projected natural gas demand for the year 2040. Moreover, future development under the anticipated General Plan build out scenario (2040) 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. Where necessary, gas service would be added to the existing system by the ER Department to meet the requirements of individual development projects in the City. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative natural gas impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Gasoline. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of impacts to the provision of natural gas is the State of California, as there is no local or singular provider for gasoline. Although the proposed project would result in an increase in vehicular trips that would result in an increased demand for gasoline, new vehicles traveling within the planning area through 2040 would likely have improved fuel efficiency and would increasingly be comprised of electric, hydrogen, and diesel vehicles (consistent with historic and current trends). In addition, the proposed project would support land use patterns and travel modes that would reduce the number of VMTs traveled within the planning area (a 9 percent decrease from 2018 to 2040), which would further reduce the project-related transportation energy demand. Furthermore, the project-related demand for gasoline would be minimal compared to the statewide availability of gasoline. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative transportation energy impacts would be considered less than cumulatively significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

The Final Recirculated EIR identified certain potentially significant effects that could result from the proposed project. However, the City finds that for each of the significant or potentially significant impacts identified in this section, based upon substantial evidence in the record, 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 Recirculated EIR. As a result, adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below would reduce the identified significant effects to a less than significant level.

Air Quality

Impact: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Localized Criteria Pollutants: Construction emissions associated with future individual projects developed under the proposed project would have the potential to cause or contribute to significant localized air quality impacts to nearby residential land uses within the planning area. To address this, regulatory measures (e.g., SCAQMD Rule 201 for a permit to operate, Rule 403 for fugitive dust control, Rule 1113 for architectural coatings, Rule 1403 for new source review, and the CARB's Airborne Toxic Control Measures) are currently in place, and mitigation would be imposed at the project level, which may include use of special equipment.

Health Effects: Localized construction impacts of future projects could potentially exceed Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs), particularly for construction of areas larger than 5 acres or areas with more intense construction activities. Therefore, without mitigation, exceedances of the LSTs could have the potential to cause or exacerbate an exceedance of the ambient air quality standards (AAQS).

SCAQMD acknowledges that they have only been able to correlate potential health outcomes for very large emissions sources; specifically, 6,620 pounds per day of NO_X and 89,180 pounds per day of VOC were expected to result in approximately 20 premature deaths per year and 89,947 school absences due to ozone. It is not expected that any future projects would generate 6,620 pounds per day of NO_X or 89,180 pounds per day of VOC emissions. Rather, based on the scale of development associated with the anticipated General Plan build out, construction projects would generate an average maximum of 46.5 pounds per day of NO_X and 60.5 pounds per day of VOC. However, individual projects would still be required to conduct a site-specific localized impact analysis that evaluates potential project health impacts at a project level to immediately adjacent land uses (refer to Compliance Measure CM AQ-1 and Mitigation Measure AQ-1) to ensure that potential health impacts associated with the construction of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Compliance Measure:

CM AQ-1: To ensure compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) rules and provide Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction of future projects facilitated under the proposed project, the construction contractor shall implement the following BMPs during construction, where feasible, to further reduce emissions from construction emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxides (NO_X), and particulate matter.

- Install temporary construction power supply meters on site and use these to provide power to electric power tools whenever feasible. If temporary electric power is available on site, forbid the use of portable gasoline- or diesel-fueled electric generators.

- Use of diesel oxidation catalysts and/or catalyzed diesel particulate traps on diesel equipment, as feasible.
- Maintain equipment according to manufacturers' specifications.
- Restrict idling of equipment and trucks to a maximum of 5 minutes (per California Air Resources Board [CARB] regulation).
- Phase grading operations to reduce disturbed areas and times of exposure.
- Avoid excavation and grading during wet weather.
- Limit on-site construction routes and stabilize construction entrance(s).
- Remove existing vegetation only when absolutely necessary.
- Sweep up spilled dry materials (e.g., cement, mortar, or dirt track-out) immediately. Never attempt to wash them away with water. Use only minimal water for dust control.
- Store stockpiled materials and wastes under a temporary roof or secured plastic sheeting or tarp.
- Properly dispose of all demolition wastes. Materials that can be recycled from demolition projects include: metal framing, wood, concrete, asphalt, and plate glass. Unusable, un-recyclable debris should be confined to dumpsters, covered at night, and taken to a landfill for disposal.
- Hazardous debris such as asbestos must be handled in accordance with specific laws and regulations and disposed of as hazardous waste. For more information on asbestos handling and disposal regulations, contact the SCAQMD.

Mitigation Measures:

MM AQ-1: Prior to issuance of any construction permits, future development projects subject to discretionary review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) shall prepare and submit to the Director of the City of Long Beach (City) Department of Development Services, or designee, a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the Department of Development Services shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the Department of Development Services. Mitigation measures to reduce construction-related emissions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Require the following fugitive-dust control measures:
  - Use nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion.
  - Apply water every 4 hours to active soil-disturbing activities.
  - Tarp and/or maintain a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials.
- Use construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) as having Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits (when available), or Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer), applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower.
- Ensure that construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturers' standards.

- Limit nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than 5 consecutive minutes.
- Using Super-Compliant volatile organic compound (VOC) paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible. (A list of Super-Compliant architectural coating manufactures can be found on the SCAQMD website at http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/brochures/Super-Compliant_AIM.pdf.)
- Suspend all soil disturbance activities when winds exceed 25 miles per hour (mph) as instantaneous gusts or when visible plumes emanate from the site and stabilize all disturbed areas.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the City of Long Beach regarding dust complaints. The SCAQMD's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
- Sweep all streets at least once a day using SCAQMD Rule 1186, 1186.1 certified street sweepers or roadway washing trucks if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets. The use of water sweepers with reclaimed water is recommended.
- Apply water three times daily or non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufactures' specifications to all unpaved parking or staging areas, unpaved road surfaces, or to areas where soil is disturbed. Reclaimed water should be used when available.
- Construction vendors, contractors, and/or haul truck operators shall utilize 2010 model year trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export) that meet the California Air Resources Board's (CARB) 2010 engine emission standards at 0.01 grams per brake horsepower-hour (g/bhp-hr) of particulate (PM) and 0.20 g/bhp-hr of nitrogen oxides (NO_X) emissions or newer, cleaner trucks. Operators shall maintain records of all trucks associated with the project construction to document that each truck used meets these emission standards, and shall make the records available for inspection.

Finding: The standard condition and the mitigation measures are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final Recirculated EIR.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact: Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition to the City's Sustainable City Action Plan (SCAP), the CARB's Scoping Plan, and the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS identify strategies to reduce GHG emissions, both of which are applicable to the proposed project. The proposed project and its policies would be consistent with applicable measures and goals identified in the City's SCAP, the CARB Scoping Plan, and SCAG's 2016–2040 RTP/SCS). Furthermore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1, which requires the City to adopt a GHG Reduction Plan or Climate Action and Adaption Plan, the proposed project would not conflict with or impede implementation of reduction goals identified in Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and Senate Bill (SB) 32. The project would also be subject to all applicable regulatory requirements, which would also reduce the GHG emissions of the project. Further, the proposed project would result in a net reduction of overall GHG emissions as compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, program, policy, or regulation related to the reduction of GHG emissions.

Mitigation Measure:

MM GHG-1: The City of Long Beach (City) shall develop and adopt a greenhouse gas (GHG) Reduction Plan or Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) to ensure that the City continues on a trajectory that aligns with the short-term, interim, and long-term State GHG reduction goals Within approximately 36 months of adoption of the proposed General Plan Land Use Element (LUE)/Urban Design Element (UDE) project, the City of Long Beach shall prepare and present a CAAP to the City Council for adoption. The CAAP shall identify strategies to be implemented to reduce GHG emissions associated with the City. In addition, the City shall monitor GHG emissions by updating its community-wide GHG emissions inventory every 5 years upon adoption of the initial CAAP, which will include details on how the reduction programs will be implemented and will designate responsible parties to monitor progress and ensure implementation of the reductions within the CAAP. A monitoring and reporting program shall be included to ensure the CAAP achieves the reduction targets.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to conflict with any applicable greenhouse gas reduction plan, policy or regulation to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final Recirculated EIR.

Noise

Impact: Expose persons to or generate excess groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. Chapter 8.80 of the City's Noise Ordinance limits the operation of any device that creates vibration, including pile driving, that is above the vibration perception threshold. Any construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed project would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance requirements. However, because the construction of future projects associated with implementation of the proposed project could result in the generation of ground-borne vibration, future discretionary projects occurring under the proposed project would also be required to comply with Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1. Specifically, Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would require future construction projects implemented under the LUE/UDE to implement construction best management practices to minimize vibration impacts for nearby sensitive receptors to a less than significant level. Compliance with Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would serve to reduce impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive ground-borne vibration or noise levels.

As discussed above, implementation of the proposed project would include policies and strategies that protect sensitive receptors from vibration in excess of acceptable levels. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the exposure of persons to excessive ground-borne vibration and/or ground-borne noise levels.

Mitigation Measure:

MM NOI-1 Project contractors shall implement the following construction best management practices during construction of activities:

- Schedule high-noise and vibration-producing activities to a shorter window of time during the day outside early morning hours to minimize disruption to sensitive uses.
- Grading and construction contractors shall use equipment that generates lower noise and vibration levels, such as rubber-tired equipment rather than metal-tracked equipment.
- Construction haul trucks and materials delivery traffic shall avoid residential areas whenever feasible.

- The construction contractor shall place noise- and vibration-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses whenever feasible.
- Locate equipment staging in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the active project site during all project construction.
- Prohibit extended idling time of internal combustion engines.
- Ensure that all general construction related activities are restricted to 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and federal holidays, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction would be permitted on Sundays. Construction activities occurring outside of these hours may be permitted with authorization by the Building Official and/or permit issued by the Noise Control Officer.
- All residential units located within 500 feet of a construction site shall be sent a notice regarding the construction schedule. A sign legible at a distance of 50 feet shall also be posted at the construction site. All notices and the signs shall indicate the dates and durations of construction activities, as well as provide a telephone number for a "noise disturbance coordinator."
- A "noise disturbance coordinator" shall be established. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g. starting too early or bad muffler, etc.) and shall be required to implement reasonable measures to reduce noise levels.
- For all projects determined to have unusual or extremely loud construction activities (e.g., pile driving, nighttime construction work, or unusually long construction duration, etc.) that would generate noise levels over 90 dBA Leq at nearby sensitive receptors, temporary noise control blanket barriers shall be installed in a manner to shield sensitive receptors land uses.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to groundborne vibration generated by construction activities to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final Recirculated EIR.

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

The following summary describes the unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project where either mitigation measures were found to be infeasible, or mitigation would lessen impacts but not to a less than significant level. The following adverse impacts would remain significant and unavoidable:

Air Quality

Impact: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. CEQA requires that general plans be evaluated for consistency with the AQMP. There are two key indicators of consistency. Indicator 1 relates to whether the project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of the AAQS or emission reductions in the AQMP. Indicator 2 relates to whether the project would exceed the assumptions in the AQMP. The AQMP strategy is, in part, based on projections from local general plans.

Indicator 1: The proposed project involves long-term growth associated with the anticipated build out of the City and therefore, emissions of criteria pollutants associated with future development allowed for under the project could contribute emissions of PM10, PM2.5, NOx, and VOCs, which could affect attainment of the AAQS. Future development allowed under the proposed project would be required to comply with CARB motor vehicle standards, SCAQMD regulations for stationary sources and architectural coatings, Title 24 energy efficiency standards, and the proposed LUE/UDE goals and policies. Additionally, future projects would be required to comply with existing City policies and regulations, as well as the proposed LUE/UDE goals and policies, in order to further reduce air quality impacts. Based on the emissions modeling prepared for the project, emissions under future with project conditions would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for VOC and CO as a result of additional housing anticipated under the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact associated with consistency with the applicable AQMP, and would not be consistent with the AQMP under the first indicator. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable, as there is no feasible mitigation available to reduce this impact.

Indicator 2: The land-use designations in the City's existing LUE form, in part, the foundation for the emissions inventory for the Basin in the AQMP. The AQMP is based on projections in population, employment, and VMT in the Basin projected by SCAG. SCAG projections for the City LUE and UDE proposed land uses are partially based on the current adopted General Plan. Implementation of the proposed General Plan LUE and UDE would not result in higher population and would not generate employment for the City compared to SCAG forecasts. Growth expected under the proposed project was estimated based on SCAG projections for population and housing units in the City. Additional units included as part of the project would serve the existing population that is currently in overcrowded housing and the LUE simply focuses that projected growth near transit. These demographic trends are incorporated into the RTP/SCS compiled by SCAG to determine priority transportation projects and VMT in the SCAG region. Growth projections of the proposed project assume the anticipated General Plan build out by the year 2040, since there is no schedule for when this development would occur. As a result, the growth projections for the City would be based on SCAG's 2016 RTP/SCS and the associated emissions inventory in SCAQMD's 2016 AQMP. Based on the requirements for consistency with emission control strategies in the AQMP, the project would be consistent with the 2016 AQMP's land use policies aimed at reducing air emissions and would not increase population or employment in the City. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the 2016 AQMP under Indicator 2. Although the project would result in less than significant impacts under Indicator 2, because impacts evaluated under Indicator 1 would remain significant and unavoidable, overall project impacts with respect to conflicts with the AQMP would be considered significant and unavoidable

Impact: Violate air quality standards or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Construction Emissions. Significant and Unavoidable Impact. Construction activities associated with future projects facilitated by project approval would cause short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants. On average, the maximum construction emissions associated with the development activity allowed under the project are not anticipated to exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) thresholds for VOC, NO_X, CO, SO_X, $PM_{2.5}$, or PM_{10} emissions. However, because the scale of construction future activities has not been determined, maximum daily emissions associated with an individual development project could potentially be significant, and mitigation would be required.

The proposed project includes goals regarding land use development and identifies policies designed to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants. While existing City policies and regulations and proposed LUE/UDE goals and policies are intended to minimize impacts associated with nonattainment criteria pollutants, Compliance Measure AQ-1 includes a list of the types of measures within the existing regulatory framework that future projects may be required to comply with based on their specific impacts to ensure that the

intended environmental protections are achieved. Additionally, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 requires the preparation of project-specific technical assessments evaluating construction-related air quality impacts to further ensure that construction-related emissions are reduced to the maximum extent feasible. However, since the combination, number, and size of projects that could be under construction at any one time are unknown, in an abundance of caution, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.

Operation Emissions. Significant and Unavoidable. Emissions associated with the anticipated General Plan build out would not exceed the daily SCAQMD regional thresholds for VOC, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, and CO in 2040 when compared to the existing conditions 2018 scenario. However, the decrease in emissions is associated with the overall decrease in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and reduction in vehicle emission rates that would occur with or without the proposed project. Therefore, an analysis was conducted to evaluate the change in emissions associated with the project, holding the emission factors constant for the year 2040. This analysis indicates that both VOC (an O_3 precursor emission) and CO emissions would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds under this scenario.

Future development under the proposed project would be required to demonstrate compliance with the AQMP, SIP, California Air Resources Board's (CARB) motor vehicle standards; SCAQMD regulations for stationary sources and architectural coatings; the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code) building efficiency standards (Title 24, Part 11) and the California Energy Code Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6); and the proposed LUE/UDE project goals and policies.

Future projects would also be required to implement Mitigation Measure AQ-2, which requires the preparation of project-specific technical assessments to ensure that operational-related emissions are reduced to the maximum extent feasible. However, operational characteristics and the associated emissions for future specific development projects cannot be determined at the time of this analysis. Therefore, despite implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2, and in an abundance of caution, the potential emissions impact associated with the operation of the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable.

Compliance Measure:

CM AQ-1: To ensure compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) rules and provide Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction of future projects facilitated under the proposed project, the construction contractor shall implement the following BMPs during construction, where feasible, to further reduce emissions from construction emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxides (NO_X), and particulate matter.

- Install temporary construction power supply meters on site and use these to provide power to electric power tools whenever feasible. If temporary electric power is available on site, forbid the use of portable gasoline- or diesel-fueled electric generators.
- Use of diesel oxidation catalysts and/or catalyzed diesel particulate traps on diesel equipment, as feasible.
- Maintain equipment according to manufacturers' specifications.
- Restrict idling of equipment and trucks to a maximum of 5 minutes (per California Air Resources Board [CARB] regulation).
- Phase grading operations to reduce disturbed areas and times of exposure.
- Avoid excavation and grading during wet weather.
- Limit on-site construction routes and stabilize construction entrance(s).
- Remove existing vegetation only when absolutely necessary.

- Sweep up spilled dry materials (e.g., cement, mortar, or dirt track-out) immediately. Never attempt to wash them away with water. Use only minimal water for dust control.
- Store stockpiled materials and wastes under a temporary roof or secured plastic sheeting or tarp.
- Properly dispose of all demolition wastes. Materials that can be recycled from demolition projects include: metal framing, wood, concrete, asphalt, and plate glass. Unusable, un-recyclable debris should be confined to dumpsters, covered at night, and taken to a landfill for disposal.
- Hazardous debris such as asbestos must be handled in accordance with specific laws and regulations and disposed of as hazardous waste. For more information on asbestos handling and disposal regulations, contact the SCAQMD.

Mitigation Measures:

MM AQ-1: Prior to issuance of any construction permits, future development projects subject to discretionary review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) shall prepare and submit to the Director of the City of Long Beach (City) Department of Development Services, or designee, a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the Department of Development Services shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the Department of Development Services. Mitigation measures to reduce construction-related emissions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Require the following fugitive-dust control measures:
    - Use nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion.
    - Apply water every 4 hours to active soil-disturbing activities.
    - Tarp and/or maintain a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials.
- Use construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) as having Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits (when available), or Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer), applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower.
- Ensure that construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturers' standards.
- Limit nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than 5 consecutive minutes.
- Using Super-Compliant volatile organic compound (VOC) paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible. (A list of Super-Compliant architectural coating manufactures can be found on the SCAQMD website at http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/brochures/Super-Compliant_AIM.pdf.)

- Suspend all soil disturbance activities when winds exceed 25 miles per hour (mph) as instantaneous gusts or when visible plumes emanate from the site and stabilize all disturbed areas.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the City of Long Beach regarding dust complaints. The SCAQMD's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
- Sweep all streets at least once a day using SCAQMD Rule 1186, 1186.1 certified street sweepers or roadway washing trucks if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets. The use of water sweepers with reclaimed water is recommended.
- Apply water three times daily or non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufactures' specifications to all unpaved parking or staging areas, unpaved road surfaces, or to areas where soil is disturbed. Reclaimed water should be used when available.
- Construction vendors, contractors, and/or haul truck operators shall utilize 2010 model year trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export) that meet the California Air Resources Board's (CARB) 2010 engine emission standards at 0.01 grams per brake horsepower-hour (g/bhp-hr) of particulate (PM) and 0.20 g/bhp-hr of nitrogen oxides (NO_X) emissions or newer, cleaner trucks. Operators shall maintain records of all trucks associated with the project construction to document that each truck used meets these emission standards, and shall make the records available for inspection.

MM AQ-2: Prior to future discretionary project approval, development project applicants shall prepare and submit to the Director of the City Department of Development Services, or designee, a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with SCAQMD methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the Department of Development Services shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the Project Conditions of Approval. Possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions include but are not limited to:

- For site-specific development that requires refrigerated vehicles, the construction documents shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical service connections at loading docks for plugging in the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions.
- Applicants for manufacturing and light industrial uses shall consider energy storage and combined heat and power in appropriate applications to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use.
- Site-specific developments with truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with CARB Rule 2845 (13 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Chapter 10, Section 2485).
- Require that 240-volt electrical outlets or Level 3 chargers be installed in parking lots that would enable charging of neighborhood electric vehicles (NEVs) and/or battery powered vehicles.
- Maximize use of solar energy including solar panels; installing the maximum possible number of solar energy arrays on the building roofs throughout the City to generate solar energy.
- Maximize the planting of trees in landscaping and parking lots.

- Use light-colored paving and roofing materials.
- Require use of electric or alternatively fueled street-sweepers with HEPA filters.
- Require use of electric lawn mowers and leaf blowers.
- Utilize only Energy Star heating, cooling, and lighting devices, and appliances.
- Use of water-based or low volatile organic compound (VOC) cleaning products.

Finding: The compliance measure and mitigation measures are feasible and substantially lessen the significant construction and operational air quality impacts of the proposed project. Implementation of these measures would minimize construction and operational emissions generated by project; however, even with implementation of the mitigation measure, potential construction and operational activities associated with future development occurring under the proposed project would be significant and unavoidable because the scale of future specific projects is not known and project-specific emissions cannot be estimated.

Impact: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Toxic Air Contaminants Emissions. Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) Emissions: The proposed project includes a number of goals and policies that are intended to minimize TAC impacts associated with sensitive receptors. In addition, specific measures for future development projects are required to ensure that the intended environmental protections are achieved. Compliance with Policy 16-13 and Mitigation Measure MM AQ-3 would ensure that mobile sources of TACs not covered under SCAQMD permits are considered during subsequent project-level environmental review. Policy 16-13 and Mitigation Measure MM AQ-3 would also require the preparation of project-specific technical health risk assessments evaluating operational-related health risk impacts to ensure that operational-related emissions are reduced to the maximum extent feasible for projects that require environmental evaluation under CEQA. However, because the scale of individual project level emissions that would be result under implementation of the LUE has not been determined or estimated and in order to present conservative assumptions, the TAC health risk impacts associated with future operation of individual projects that may occur with implementation of the proposed project are assumed to be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure:

MM AQ-3: Prior to future discretionary approval for projects that require environmental evaluation under CEQA, the City of Long Beach shall evaluate new development proposals for new industrial or warehousing land uses that (1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered transport refrigeration units, and (2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, or nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use. Such projects shall submit a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to the City Department of Development Services. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the SCAQMD. If the HRA shows that the incremental health risks exceed their respective thresholds, as established by the SCAQMD at the time a project is considered, the Applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms to reduce risks to an acceptable level. T-BACTs may include, but are not limited to, restricting idling on site or electrifying warehousing docks to reduce diesel particulate matter, or requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. T-BACTs identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site

plan.

Finding: The compliance measure and mitigation measures are feasible and substantially lessen the emissions of TACs and their associated impacts on sensitive receptors. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-3 requires the preparation of project-specific technical assessments evaluating potential construction and operational-related air quality impacts to ensure that criteria pollutant emissions and emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) are reduced to the maximum extent feasible. However, in an abundance of caution, the potential emissions impact associated with the operation of future projects facilitated by the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable even with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-3.

Impact: Cumulative air quality impacts.

The cumulative study area analyzed for potential air quality impacts is the South Coast Air Basin (Basin). Each project in the Basin is required to comply with SCAQMD rules and regulations and is subject to independent review.

Future development that may occur with implementation of the project would contribute criteria pollutants to the area during project construction and operation. However, future development under the proposed project would be required to comply with CARB motor vehicle standards, SCAQMD regulations from stationary sources and architectural coatings, CALGreen Code building efficiency standards (Title 24, Part 11) and the California Energy Code Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6), and the proposed LUE/UDE project goals and policies.

Since the combination, number, and size of projects that could be under construction at any one time are unknown, even with implementation of MM AQ-1, the proposed project would result in significant cumulative construction emissions from criteria pollutants. Additionally, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM AQ-2, operational impacts from criteria pollutant emissions would contribute to an O_3 exceedance, which could hinder the attainment of air quality standards. Further, cumulative growth within the City could result in potential TAC health risks exceeding 10 in one million and could cumulatively contribute to elevated health risks in the Basin, as identified in the Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study (MATES). Therefore, air quality emissions associated with future development that may occur under the proposed project could result in cumulatively considerable impacts, even with implementation of mitigation.

Compliance Measure:
Refer to Compliance Measure AQ-1

Mitigation Measures:
Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3.

Finding: The compliance measure and mitigation measures are feasible and substantially lessen the cumulative air quality impacts of the proposed project. Implementation of these measures would minimize emissions generated by project; however, even with implementation of these compliance and mitigation measures, cumulative air air quality emissions associated with future development that may occur under the proposed project could result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

Global Climate Change

Impact: Generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. Implementation of the proposed project would contribute to global climate change (GCC) through direct

and indirect emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) from land uses within the City of Long Beach (City). On a per capita basis, the anticipated build out of the proposed project would reduce the GHG emissions from 3.8 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) per year per service population (MT of CO_2e/yr/SP) under existing conditions down to 2.5 MT of CO_2e/yr/SP. Although the GHG emissions per service population would be lower under future year conditions, the emission rate of 2.5 MT CO_2e/yr/SP would exceed the 1.92 MT CO_2e/yr/SP criterion established by the City for purposes of this environmental evaluation.

While the proposed project includes various policies that would contribute to reduced GHG emissions, the City would require assistance from additional federal and State programs and regulations to achieve the long-term GHG emissions goal and efficiency threshold. Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would reduce GHG emissions. However, in addition to the proposed mitigation measure, additional statewide measures may be required in order to meet the service population threshold set by the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP). Because the performance of GHG reduction measures in the CAAP and compliance with future targets cannot be assured at this time, and in an abundance of caution, GHG emission impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure:

GHG-1: The City of Long Beach (City) shall develop and adopt a greenhouse gas (GHG) Reduction Plan or Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) to ensure that the City continues on a trajectory that aligns with the short-term, interim, and long-term State GHG reduction goals Within approximately 36 months of adoption of the proposed General Plan Land Use Element (LUE)/Urban Design Element (UDE) project, the City of Long Beach shall prepare and present a CAAP to the City Council for adoption. The CAAP shall identify strategies to be implemented to reduce GHG emissions associated with the City. In addition, the City shall monitor GHG emissions by updating its community-wide GHG emissions inventory every 5 years upon adoption of the initial CAAP, which will include details on how the reduction programs will be implemented and will designate responsible parties to monitor progress and ensure implementation of the reductions within the CAAP. A monitoring and reporting program shall be included to ensure the CAAP achieves the reduction targets.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible. Although the implementation of the proposed project would result in lower GHG emissions within the City as compared to existing conditions, because the project would generate emissions above the interim threshold level and because no additional statewide measures are currently available that can be implemented, potential GHG emission impacts under the horizon year 2040 scenario would remain significant and unavoidable.

Noise:

Impact: Generate a substantial increase in noise levels in excess of standards established by the City of Long Beach or applicable standards of other agencies.

Short-Term Construction-Related Noise Impacts. Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction of potential development allowed by the LUE. First, construction crew commutes and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the site for future projects would incrementally increase noise levels on access roads leading to the sites. Although there would be a relatively high single-event noise exposure potential causing intermittent noise nuisance, the effect on longer-term (hourly or daily) ambient noise levels would be small.

The second type of short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during demolition, site preparation, excavation, grading, and building erection on the future project sites. The maximum noise level generated by a typical loud piece of construction equipment (e.g., a scraper) on future project sites would be approximately 87 A-weighted decibels (dBA) maximum instantaneous noise level (L_{max}) at 50 ft from the piece of equipment. Assuming that each piece of construction equipment operates at some distance from the other equipment, the worst-case combined noise level during this phase of future construction would be 91 dBA L_{max} at a distance of 50 ft from the active construction area.

Specific construction project data that may occur with implementation of the LUE/UDE, including location and noise levels at surrounding sensitive receptors, are unknown at this time. Some projects may have unusual or extremely loud construction activities (e.g., pile driving, nighttime construction work, or unusually long construction duration, etc.). Therefore, construction projects may result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels, and mitigation would be required. Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would require future construction projects implemented under the LUE/UDE to implement Construction BMPS to reduce potential construction-period noise impacts for nearby sensitive receptors Although Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would reduce construction noise associated with future projects, since the location, proximity to sensitive receptors, and type of construction equipment associated with new construction projects are unknown at this time, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure:

MM NOI-1 Project contractors shall implement the following construction best management practices during construction of activities:

- Schedule high-noise and vibration-producing activities to a shorter window of time during the day outside early morning hours to minimize disruption to sensitive uses.
- Grading and construction contractors shall use equipment that generates lower noise and vibration levels, such as rubber-tired equipment rather than metal-tracked equipment.
- Construction haul trucks and materials delivery traffic shall avoid residential areas whenever feasible.
- The construction contractor shall place noise- and vibration-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses whenever feasible.
- Locate equipment staging in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the active project site during all project construction.
- Prohibit extended idling time of internal combustion engines.
- Ensure that all general construction related activities are restricted to 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and federal holidays, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction would be permitted on Sundays. Construction activities occurring outside of these hours may be permitted with authorization by the Building Official and/or permit issued by the Noise Control Officer.
- All residential units located within 500 feet of a construction site shall be sent a notice regarding the construction schedule. A sign legible at a distance of 50 feet shall also be posted at the construction site. All notices and the signs shall indicate the dates and durations of construction activities, as well as provide a telephone number for a "noise disturbance coordinator."
- A "noise disturbance coordinator" shall be established. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g.

starting too early or bad muffler, etc.) and shall be required to implement reasonable measures to reduce noise levels.

- For all projects determined to have unusual or extremely loud construction activities (e.g., pile driving, nighttime construction work, or unusually long construction duration, etc.) that would generate noise levels over 90 dBA Leq at nearby sensitive receptors, temporary noise control blanket barriers shall be installed in a manner to shield sensitive receptors land uses.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and substantially lessen significant construction impacts related to generation of a substantial increase in noise levels in excess of standards established by the City of Long Beach or applicable standards of other agenciesFinal Recirculated EIR. However, even with implementation of the mitigation measure, potential construction activities associated with future development occurring under the proposed project would be significant and unavoidable because the scale of future specific projects is not known and project-specific noise impacts cannot be estimated.

Impact: Cumulative Noise Impacts-Construction-Related Noise Impacts.

Construction activities associated with development anticipated under the proposed project would be subject to compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance to ensure that noise impacts from construction sources are reduced. In addition, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1, individual projects would be required to implement construction best management practices to reduce potential construction-period noise impacts for nearby sensitive receptors. Although Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would reduce construction noise associated with future projects, since the location, the proximity to sensitive receptors, and the types of construction equipment associated with new construction projects are all unknown at this time, in an abundance of caution, cumulative construction noise impacts would have a significant and unavoidable cumulative contribution to the total noise environment in the City.

Mitigation Measure:

MM NOI-1 Project contractors shall implement the following construction best management practices during construction of activities:

- Schedule high-noise and vibration-producing activities to a shorter window of time during the day outside early morning hours to minimize disruption to sensitive uses.
- Grading and construction contractors shall use equipment that generates lower noise and vibration levels, such as rubber-tired equipment rather than metal-tracked equipment.
- Construction haul trucks and materials delivery traffic shall avoid residential areas whenever feasible.
- The construction contractor shall place noise- and vibration-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses whenever feasible.
- Locate equipment staging in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the active project site during all project construction.
- Prohibit extended idling time of internal combustion engines.
- Ensure that all general construction related activities are restricted to 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and federal holidays, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction would be permitted on Sundays. Construction activities occurring outside of these hours may be permitted with authorization by the Building Official and/or permit issued by the Noise Control Officer.

- All residential units located within 500 feet of a construction site shall be sent a notice regarding the construction schedule. A sign legible at a distance of 50 feet shall also be posted at the construction site. All notices and the signs shall indicate the dates and durations of construction activities, as well as provide a telephone number for a "noise disturbance coordinator."
- A "noise disturbance coordinator" shall be established. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g. starting too early or bad muffler, etc.) and shall be required to implement reasonable measures to reduce noise levels.
- For all projects determined to have unusual or extremely loud construction activities (e.g., pile driving, nighttime construction work, or unusually long construction duration, etc.) that would generate noise levels over 90 dBA Leq at nearby sensitive receptors, temporary noise control blanket barriers shall be installed in a manner to shield sensitive receptors land uses.

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and substantially lessens cumulative construction impacts related to generation of a substantial increase in noise levels in excess of standards established by the City of Long Beach or applicable standards of other agencies. However, even with implementation of the mitigation measure, potential construction activities associated with future development occurring under the proposed project would be significant and unavoidable because the scale of future specific projects is not known and cumulative construction noise impacts cannot be estimated.

Transportation

Impact: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

Arterial Intersections. State agencies forecast regional demographic growth and the MPO (i.e., SCAG) uses the data provided by the State for the RTP/SCS process. As established in the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS, demographic trends for the planning area (e.g., population and employment growth) are forecast to occur whether or not the proposed LUE/UDE are adopted. This has been shown to be true in Long Beach, where overcrowding resulted from population increase occurring even without a sufficient housing increase to support it. As is required by CEQA, however, the TIA for the proposed project compared traffic conditions in the future associated with the anticipated General Plan Build Out (2040) scenario with existing conditions (2018). Results of this analysis indicated that traffic growth associated with the anticipated General Plan Build Out would result in significant impacts at 48 of the 120 intersections included in the study area (40 percent).

In order to provide an expanded comparison of the effects of the increased housing and locational change of land use concentration in the proposed project, the TIA also compared the results of the General Plan Build Out (2040) No Project and the anticipated General Plan Build Out (2040) With the Project scenarios. Results of this analysis showed that when compared to the previous plan, the project would result in some intersections operating better and some intersections operating poorer due to the redistribution of land uses.

Congestion Management Program Intersections. The Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) monitors 10 intersections within the City of Long Beach. Based on the analysis presented in the TIA, future traffic growth and traffic growth associated with the proposed project are anticipated to result in level of service (LOS) F conditions (with a 0.02 or greater increase in volume-to-capacity [v/c]) at 4 of the 10 CMP intersections in Long Beach and would, therefore, have a significant impact.

Caltrans Ramp Intersections. Based on the analysis in the TIA, 6 of the 30 sampled Caltrans intersections operate at unsatisfactory LOS (i.e., beyond LOS E) in the existing condition and would continue to operate at unsatisfactory LOS in the future regardless of the project. Two additional intersections function at LOS E or better in existing conditions, but would function at LOS F in the future regardless of the project.

According to the performance criteria established for this TIA, the project is found to have potentially significant impacts on the following Caltrans intersections according to Caltrans impact criteria (i.e., contribution of traffic to a facility operating in excess of its operational standard). Because this analysis sampled Caltrans intersections, potentially significant traffic impacts may occur at additional intersections not included in the list below.

- Redondo Avenue/Pacific Coast Highway
- Lakewood Boulevard/Del Amo Boulevard
- Lakewood Boulevard/Spring Street
- Lakewood Boulevard/I-405 Eastbound Ramps
- Pacific Coast Highway/Anaheim Street
- I-605 Southbound Ramps/Carson Street

Caltrans Arterial and Freeway Facilities. The TIA analyzed freeway facilities including mainline segments, merging segments, and diverge segments. Many of these facilities were found to function beyond their designed LOS in existing conditions. The project would contribute additional traffic volume, which would constitute a significant impact according to the established criteria. On- and off-ramps in the study area were found to meet the design guidelines.

The TIA analyzed arterials that are on the State Highway System. The performance of these roadways was found to meet LOS standards meaning that vehicle delay on these facilities is a result of intersection performance.

Potential Physical Improvements. The TIA identified potentially significant traffic impacts to vehicle LOS at intersections in Long Beach, intersections in neighboring cities, Caltrans intersections, and freeway facilities. Of the 120 intersections included in the study area, 48 of them (40 percent) would be significantly impacted by traffic volume increases between existing and future conditions. The TIA considered the physical improvements necessary for impacted intersections to function at LOS D with projected future traffic volumes. The TIA also considered the constraints to constructing the physical improvements. Constraints could include the intersection being located outside of the City's jurisdiction, which eliminates the City's authority to compel physical improvements. Physical improvements located outside of the existing right-of-way could be infeasible or result in increased environmental impacts.

Physical improvements outside of existing rights-of-way would be further challenged if impacting existing structures or open space. Constraints could also exist if improvements could be completed within the existing rights-of-way but would conflict with other travel modes. The Mobility Element states that "the City may accept levels of service below the City standard of D in exchange for pedestrian, bicycle, and/or transit improvements. This balanced approach will help the City create a more balanced multimodal transportation system that supports appropriate infill projects and transit-oriented development strategies."

All of the physical improvements necessary for impacted intersections to function at LOS D are subject to constraints that render the addition of vehicle capacity infeasible. Capacity enhancement of freeway facilities is also infeasible because the City cannot compel Caltrans to make improvements. In addition, analysis of freeway mainline segments show that up to 6 additional travel lanes might be necessary on freeways that are from 6–10 lanes wide currently. Additionally, capacity enhancements to freeway facilities to accommodate peak hour traffic volume may not be effective as additional traffic could be attracted from the shoulder periods (i.e., time periods just before or after peak periods).

If the addition of capacity is infeasible to mitigate the impacts to the v/c ratio at an intersection or freeway facility, a reduction in traffic volume may mitigate the impact. The Mobility Element presents a number of Implementation Measures designed to promote mobility by supporting all travel modes, including walking, bicycling, and use of transit, thereby reducing the number of automobile trips on the roadway network. However, the effect of these measures on individual intersection LOS cannot be guaranteed because they rely on the changing attitudes and actions of many commuters. In addition, when some automobile trips are converted into alternative modes, some automobile trips that would otherwise have been discouraged by congestion may occur. Therefore, although these measures would contribute to a reduced vehicle LOS, their effects cannot be quantified, and they cannot be considered mitigation for the impacted freeway facilities and 48 impacted intersections for the purposes of CEQA. Therefore, Mitigation Measure T-1 is recommended to reduce the level of traffic impacts.

Mitigation Measure T-1 would require consideration of feasible traffic improvements at the time individual projects are proposed. If individual projects contribute to transportation impacts for which physical improvement is feasible, then physical improvements would be implemented and transportation impacts would be reduced. However, if feasible physical improvements are not feasible, then transportation impacts would remain significant. Therefore, implementation of the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to a program, plan, ordinance, or policy.

Mitigation Measure:

MM T-1 Prior to approval of any discretionary project that is forecast to generate 100 or more peak-hour trips, as determined by the City of Long Beach (City) Traffic Engineer, the property owners/developers shall prepare a traffic improvement analysis of any facilities under the jurisdiction of Caltrans at which the project is anticipated to contribute 50 or more peak-hour trips, analyzing the impact on such state transportation facilities where Caltrans has previously prepared a valid traffic study, as identified below, and identified feasible operational and physical improvements and has determined the associated fees necessary to mitigate project-related impacts. The fair share cost of such improvements shall be assessed if transportation analysis demonstrates such improvements can achieve vehicle level of service (LOS) D (as measured by Intersection Capacity Utilization or Highway Capacity Manual methodology) or an improved vehicle level of service, if LOS D cannot be feasibly achieved. The Conditions of Approval for the project shall require the property owner/developer to construct, bond for, or pay reasonable fair share fees to the City who will work jointly with Caltrans to implement such improvements, unless alternative funding sources have been identified.

In the event that Caltrans prepares a valid study, as defined below, that identifies fair share contribution funding sources attributable to and paid from private development to supplement other regional and State funding sources necessary to undertake improvements of impacted state transportation facilities, then the project applicant shall use reasonable efforts to pay the applicable fair share amount to Caltrans. The study shall be reviewed and approved by the California Transportation Commission. It shall include fair share contributions related to private development based on nexus requirements contained in the Mitigation Fee Act (Govt. Code § 66000 et seq.) and 14 Cal. Code of Regs. § 15126.4(a)(4) and, to this end, the study shall recognize that impacts to Caltrans facilities that are not attributable to development located within the City of Long Beach are not required to pay in excess of such developments' fair share obligations. The fee study shall also be compliant with Government Code § 66001(g) and any other applicable provisions of law. If Caltrans chooses to accept the project Applicant's fair share payment, Caltrans shall apply the payment to the fee program adopted by Caltrans or agreed upon by the City and Caltrans as a result of the fair share fee study.

Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1 is feasible. While recommended improvements and implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1 could contribute to an improved vehicle LOS, the effectiveness of these improvements cannot be quantified at this time, as future specific projects have not been identified; therefore, these improvements cannot be considered mitigation for the 48 impacted study area intersections for the purposes of CEQA. Therefore, impacts to the 48 intersections are considered significant and unavoidable for the horizon year of 2040.

In addition, the *Traffic Impact Analysis* also identified significant impacts at 4 of the 10 monitored intersections within the study area based on Los Angeles County's 2010 CMP criteria. Despite recommended improvements in Mitigation Measure T-1, potentially significant impacts to California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) intersections and freeway facilities may remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, project-related traffic impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact: Result in cumulative traffic impacts. The project proposes an update to the City's General Plan that would affect development patterns throughout the City. As such, because the proposed project is a citywide policy action that would facilitate future development throughout the entire City, the proposed project itself is cumulative in nature.

Under the anticipated General Plan (2040) build out scenario, the project would result in potentially significant traffic impacts to vehicle LOS at intersections in Long Beach, intersections in neighboring cities, Caltrans intersections, and freeway facilities. Of the 120 intersections included in the study area, 48 of them (40 percent) would be significantly impacted by traffic volume increases between existing and future conditions. Potential physical improvements at each impacted location was considered against potential constraints, such as the intersection being located outside of the City's jurisdiction, which eliminates the City's authority to compel physical improvements or physical improvements being located outside of the existing right-of-way, which could be infeasible or result in increased environmental impacts. Furthermore, the effect of the Implementation Measures in the Mobility Element in reducing traffic volume cannot be guaranteed to reduce impacts. Because measures to increase vehicle capacity or reduce vehicle volume cannot be guaranteed and may not be feasible, the impacts identified above are considered cumulatively significant and unavoidable for the horizon year of 2040.

Mitigation Measure:
Refer to Mitigation Measure T-1, above.

Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1 is feasible. After implementing Mitigation Measure MM T-1, some of the potentially significant traffic impacts to intersections in Long Beach, intersections in neighboring cities, Caltrans intersections, and freeway facilities may be reduced while others are likely to remain significant and unavoidable.

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." CEQA does not require an EIR to

consider every conceivable alternative to a project, but rather it must consider a range of feasible alternatives that would assist decision-makers and the public in evaluating the comparative merits of alternatives to a proposed project. 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 Recirculated EIR identified four alternatives as follows:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: Reduced Project Alternative

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

Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative

Description: This alternative would involve no amendments to the City of Long Beach's (City) General Plan, no adoption of PlaceTypes, and no changes to the existing land use designations in the City's planning documents. The existing General Plan Land Use Element (LUE) and the Scenic Routes Element (SRE) would continue to determine land uses and design principles that guide future development in the City.

Environmental Effects: Under the No Project Alternative, development would continue as allowed under the 1989 General Plan LUE and 1975 SRE and is anticipated to result in 15,121 fewer housing units as compared to the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would not require a General Plan Update/Amendment, Local Coastal Plan Amendment, or Rezone Amendment. No change to the adopted land use designations would occur. Overall, impacts for the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed project. However, similar to the proposed project, under the No Project scenario, significant unavoidable air quality, GHG, noise, and traffic impacts would continue to occur.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: The No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the 17 Project Objectives. The No Project Alternative would not help the City achieve its goal of creating great places through the establishment of new PlaceTypes and urban design principles not currently provided in the City's General Plan. Although the No Project Alternative would accommodate the same amount of population and employment growth as the proposed project, this alternative would be inconsistent with the project and the City's objective to comply with State-mandated affordable housing options as required by the RHNA process and the AFH conducted by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. Moreover, failure to comply with the RHNA mandate is enforceable through the Housing Accountability Act and could result in a loss of funding to the City and legal action by the State, as evidenced by the State's recent actions elsewhere in Southern California. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would exacerbate existing issues related to overcrowding, would likely decrease affordability, and could result in punitive actions by the State because of the City's failure to meet its affordable housing requirements.

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 at all or 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 has been rejected from further consideration.

Facts in Support of the Finding: Because this alternative would not result in land use changes associated with the proposed project, it would reduce potentially significant air quality, GHG emissions, noise and traffic impacts. However, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not satisfy any of the Project Objectives nor would it realize the project benefits of accommodating projected increases in population; providing additional community services; diversifying the local economy; encouraging sustainable development practices; retaining the character and quality of existing neighborhoods in the City; and providing additional options for housing and mobility. 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.

Alternative 2: Reduced Project Alternative

Description: This Reduced Project Alternative assumes the planning area would be subject to the LUE and UDE goals, strategies, and policies similar to those included under the proposed project, but with adjustments to the proposed PlaceType intensities. This alternative would decrease overall intensities by 25 percent on a citywide basis as compared to the proposed project. In total, Alternative 2 would facilitate 21,393 dwelling units (7,131 fewer residential units than the proposed project) and 10,156,963 square feet of non-residential uses (3,385,654 fewer non-residential square feet than the proposed project). Alternative 2 would require a General Plan Update/Amendment, a future Local Coastal Plan Amendment, and a Rezone Amendment, similar to the proposed project.

Environmental Effects: Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would result in significant unavoidable impacts related to air quality, GHG emissions, noise, and transportation. Although the decreased efficiency of development intensity near transit in Alternative 2 could lead to more significant impacts related to some air quality, GHG, and transportation sub-sectors, due to the reduction in development potential under Alternative 2, overall impacts would be less than with the proposed project.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would implement 14 new PlaceTypes and design standards included in the LUE and UDE. However, this alternative would not achieve the Project Objectives to the same extent as the proposed project due to land use reductions throughout the City, particularly those focused near transit.

Alternative 2 would promote livability, environmental quality, community health and safety, the quality of the built environment, and economic vitality (Project Objective 1) through implementation of the LUE and UDE. While Alternative 2 would include many of the features of the proposed project, this alternative's consistency with the overall LUE goals of creating compact new development (Project Objective 4), job growth (Project Objective 5), and land use changes that coincide with the regional economy (Project Objective 6) would be achieved at a lesser extent due to the reduction in development potential under this alternative. Alternative 2 would, however, include PlaceTypes that encourage sustainable development practices comprised of placemaking principles and design standards to create walkable and complete neighborhoods (Project Objectives 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, and 17).

This alternative would achieve some of the Project Objectives related to the provision of diverse housing types (although less diverse housing type options may be provided under this alternative as fewer projects would be built), and would preserve existing neighborhoods (Project Objectives 7 and 8); however, Alternative 2 would not meet Project Objective 2 related to meeting housing needs identified during the RHNA process (7,048 new dwelling units by the year 2021) and the AFH (21,476 housing units to address existing housing needs). The Open Space PlaceType under Alternative 2 would ensure access to natural and urban open spaces, as well their maintenance, restoration, and preservation (Project Objectives 11, 12, and 15). Similar to the proposed project, the 14 PlaceTypes would be distributed across the planning areas to ensure planning decisions are equitable and City investments are distributed in a manner that serves both new and existing developments in the City (Project Objectives 9 and 10). This alternative would meet many of the Project Objectives, but not as many or 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 Reduced Project Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed project and is rejected from further consideration.

Facts in Support of the Finding: Fundamental objectives of the proposed project include accommodating projected increases in population; providing additional community services; diversifying the local economy; encouraging sustainable development practices; retaining the character and quality of existing neighborhoods in the City; and providing additional options for housing and mobility. The Reduced Project Alternative would not allow for the same degree of new development proposed as part of the project, and as such, would not be able to meet the City's full demand for new housing units, community services, diverse business opportunities, sustainable development, and aesthetic improvements. In particular, the City's housing obligations under state law could not be met. For these reasons, this alternative would not maximize the potential of the project and would not meet the needs of the community. Future development under this alternative would also generate significantly less revenue for the City due to the reduction in housing units and employment opportunities as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, the reduction of proposed development under this alternative would result in a less positive contribution to the City than the proposed project. This alternative would be inconsistent with some of the Project Objectives, would not fully meet other Project Objectives, and overall would 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 Project Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed project and is rejected from further consideration.

IV. GENERAL FINDINGS

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

2. To the degree that any impacts described in the Final Recirculated 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 Recirculated EIR. Any

significant effects described in such comments were avoided or substantially lessened by the standard conditions and mitigation measures described in the Final Recirculated EIR.

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

V. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONDITIONS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the lead agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve a project (PRC Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a)). CEQA also requires that when a public agency approves a project that will result in the occurrence of significant and unavoidable adverse impacts to the environment, the agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the certified EIR and/or other information in the record (PRC Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b)). The Program EIR for the Long Beach Land Use Element and Urban Design Element (Proposed Plan) identifies significant impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Plan. These Statement of Overriding Considerations are based on substantial evidence in the record, including but not limited to the Draft EIR, the Final EIR, plans, staff reports, and documents, testimony, and all other materials that constitute the Record of Proceedings. The EIR concluded that, despite the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures, the Proposed Plan would result in the following potential unavoidable significant adverse impacts that are not mitigated to a less-than-significant level:

- Air Quality (conflicts with Air Quality Management Plan, construction and operation emissions, exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, cumulative air quality impacts)
- Global Climate Change (greenhouse gas emissions)
- Noise (short-term construction related noise, cumulative noise impacts)
- Transportation (Arterial Intersections, Congestion Management Program Intersections, Caltrans Ramp Intersections, and Caltrans Arterial and Freeway Facilities)

- Air Quality (conflicts with Air Quality Management Plan, construction and operation emissions, exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, cumulative air quality impacts) The proposed project would have significant unavoidable impacts related to conflicts with an adopted Air Quality Management Plan, the violation of applicable air quality standards, and the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The project would result in conflicts with the 2016 AQMP because air emissions under future with project conditions would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for VOC and CO as a result of additional housing anticipated under the proposed project. Construction and operational activities associated with future development occurring under the proposed project would be significant and unavoidable because the scale of future specific projects is not known and project-specific emissions cannot be estimated. Compliance Measure CM AQ-1 requires future projects to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) rules and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce air pollutant emissions during the construction of future projects facilitated by approval of the proposed project. In addition, Mitigation Measures MMs AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3 require the preparation of project-specific technical assessments evaluating potential construction and operational-related air quality impacts to ensure that criteria pollutant emissions and emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) are reduced to the maximum extent feasible. However, in an abundance of caution, the potential emissions impact associated with the operation of future

projects facilitated by the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable even with implementation of Mitigation Measures MMs AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3.

- Global Climate Change (greenhouse gas emissions) The proposed project would have significant unavoidable impacts related to the generation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that could significantly impact the environment. Implementation of the proposed project would contribute to Global Climate Change (GCC) through direct and indirect emissions of GHGs from land uses within the City of Long Beach. On a service population basis, the anticipated General Plan build out would reduce the GHG emissions from 3.8 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) per year per service population (MT of CO2e/yr/SP) under existing conditions down to 2.5 MT CO2e/yr/SP (with reduction measures incorporated). Although the GHG emissions per service population would be lower under future year conditions, the emission rate of 2.5 MT CO2e/yr/SP would exceed the 1.92 MT CO2e/yr/SP criterion established by the City in its draft City of Long Beach Climate Action and Adaptation Plan GHG Emissions Reduction Target Options Memo (2018) and used for purposes of this environmental evaluation. As such, Mitigation Measure MM GHG-1 would be required to reduce GHG emissions. This measure requires the preparation of a GHG Reduction Plan or Climate Action Plan to ensure that future development projects meet or exceed the statewide goals aimed at the reduction of GHG emissions. In addition to the proposed mitigation measure, additional statewide measures would be necessary to reduce GHG emissions from development that may occur with adoption of the proposed project to meet the long-term GHG reduction goals. Although the implementation of the proposed project would result in lower GHG emissions within the City as compared to existing conditions, because the project would generate emissions above the interim threshold level and because no additional statewide measures are currently available that can be implemented, GHG emission impacts under the horizon year 2040 scenario would remain significant and unavoidable.

- Noise (short-term construction related noise, cumulative noise impacts) The proposed project would result in significant unavoidable construction-related impacts. Construction activities associated with development anticipated under the project would be subject to compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance to ensure that noise impacts from construction sources are reduced. Some projects may have unusual or extremely loud construction activities (e.g., pile driving, nighttime construction work, or unusually long construction duration, etc.). Therefore, construction projects may result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels, and mitigation would be required. Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would require future construction projects to implement construction best management practices to reduce potential construction period noise impacts for nearby sensitive receptors. Although Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would reduce construction noise associated with future projects, because the location, the proximity to sensitive receptors, and the type of construction equipment associated with new construction projects are all unknown at this time, in an abundance of caution construction noise impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

- Transportation (Arterial Intersections, Congestion Management Program Intersections, Caltrans Ramp Intersections, and Caltrans Arterial and Freeway Facilities) The proposed project would have significant unavoidable impacts related to conflicts with applicable plans, ordinances, and policies, as well as conflicts with an applicable Congestion Management Plan (CMP). The Traffic Impact Analysis (LSA 2019) prepared for the proposed project determined that 48 intersections could be significantly impacted by implementation of future development projects in the anticipated 2040 General Plan build out scenario based on the City's criteria. Potentially significant traffic impacts were also identified at freeway facilities. Although physical

improvements that would retain the performance goal of level of service (LOS) D were identified, all of the physical improvements necessary for impacted intersections to function at LOS D are subject to constraints that render the addition of vehicle capacity infeasible (see Table 4.8.I). The City's Capital Improvement Program, Mobility Element, and/or applicable specific plans were also reviewed for pending and planned vehicle and non-vehicle capacity improvements throughout the City. As such, applicants for future discretionary projects would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure MM T-1. Mitigation Measure MM T-1 requires applicants for future projects to prepare a traffic improvement analysis to identify feasible physical improvements to reduce impacts at intersections within the planning area. While recommended improvements and implementation of Mitigation Measure MM T-1 could contribute to a reduced vehicle LOS, the effectiveness of these improvements cannot be quantified at this time, as future specific projects have not been identified; therefore, these improvements cannot be considered mitigation for the 48 impacted study area intersections for the purposes of CEQA. Therefore, impacts to the 48 intersections are considered significant and unavoidable for the horizon year of 2040. In addition to identifying significant and unavoidable impacts at the 48 impacted intersections based on the City's criteria, the Traffic Impact Analysis also identified significant impacts at 4 of the 10 monitored intersections within the study area based on Los Angeles County's 2010 CMP criteria. Despite recommended improvements in Mitigation Measure MM T-1, potentially significant impacts to California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) intersections and freeway facilities may remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the impacts to these intersections are considered significant and unavoidable for the horizon year of 2040.

The project alternatives would not satisfy the project objectives as effectively as the Proposed Plan. Accordingly, the City Council adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. The City recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts would result from implementation of the Proposed Plan. Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) rejected alternatives to the Proposed Plan for the reasons discussed above, (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iv) balanced the benefits of the Proposed Plan, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, against the Proposed Plan's potential significant and unavoidable impacts, the City Council hereby finds that the benefits of the Proposed Plan outweigh and override the potential significant unavoidable impacts for the reasons stated below.

Reasons to Support Approval of the Proposed Plan

After balancing the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the Proposed Plan, the City of Long Beach has determined that the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified above may be considered "acceptable" due to the following specific considerations, which outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts of the Proposed Plan. The City Council finds that each one of the following overriding considerations independently, grouped by overarching theme, or taken collectively, is/are sufficient to outweigh the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Proposed Plan:

1. The Proposed Plan is consistent with state, regional and local policies that promote greenhouse gas reductions through a development pattern focused around transit and creation of complete communities to reduces vehicle miles travelled, including the SCAG RTP/SCS and the Long Beach General Plan Mobility Element. The more compact, mixed-use development pattern also results in more efficient use of land and natural resources as compared to a more dispersed development pattern on a regional scale.
2. The Proposed Plan accommodates employment, housing, and population growth projections forecasted through the planning horizon year of 2040 by concentrating accommodation of

residential development and new job-generating uses around transit stations and corridors, with a focus on Major Areas of Change throughout the City. These forecasts were developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

3. The Proposed Plan maintains and expands the City's jobs base and increases opportunities for economic development particularly in mixed-use, Downtown, commercial and neo-industrial PlaceTypes, in order to increase the generation of tax revenue in the City that will help pay for the provision of City services while seeking to reduce vehicle miles travelled by providing more jobs accessible to residents who predominantly commute out of the City for work. This expansion of employment opportunities is consistent with the City's adopted Economic Blueprint and is necessary to meet AB32 and SB375 targets and goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions particularly from the transportation sector. Expansion of employment opportunities is also necessary to reduce poverty and increase employment and housing opportunities particularly for low-income and disadvantaged communities.
4. The Proposed Plan puts forth substantial new sustainability and environmental policies and the Neo-Industrial PlaceType, which represents an innovative approach to creating and retaining employment while reducing the environmental impacts by incentivizing light manufacturing, more environmentally oriented and clean industries, and other emerging 21st Century jobs in select former industrial areas of the City proximate to residential areas.
5. The Proposed Plan includes policies to increase housing availability and housing type options, particularly housing accessible to transit with the intention of increasing transit ridership.
6. The Proposed Plan increases mobility choices; promotes transit ridership and other alternative transit modes; and reduces vehicle miles traveled per capita for those who live and/or work in Long Beach.
7. The Proposed Plan furthers the City's Mobility Element, to expand access to multi-modal transportation options and to ensure new development is pedestrian-oriented, context-sensitive, and is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods through the design of buildings, streets, and the public realm.
8. The Proposed Plan stimulates vibrancy and activity and creates a unique sense of place within each PlaceType through the design of buildings, streets, and the public realm.
9. The Proposed Plan would protect the quality of life for existing and future residents and confer citywide benefits through goals and policies designed to create more complete communities and facilitate the redistribution of land uses throughout the City, including through incorporation of smart growth principles. The Proposed Plan provides for concentrated, mixed-use development near transit nodes and along transit corridors, in order to conserve resources, protect existing residential neighborhoods, and improve air quality by reducing vehicle miles traveled per capita. The Proposed Plan would foster thriving transit centers by focusing growth in major transit and commercial areas and by creating walkable, attractive and complete neighborhoods that provide a greater mix of jobs and housing for a range of income levels, and greater access to goods and services. This development pattern reduces vehicle mode share and vehicle miles traveled per capita emissions regionally, promoting sustainable development in support of SB32 targets for greenhouse gases in 2030, the SB375 regional targets for 2020 and 2035, as well progress toward 2045 and 2050 goals found in relevant California Executive Orders and California Air Resources Board actions. The overall reduction in regional vehicle miles traveled per capita would contribute to lowered greenhouse gas emissions in the region.
10. The Proposed Plan implements a compact development pattern consistent with SB 375 and the Sustainable Communities Strategy, adopted by SCAG, and therefore would contribute to decreasing regional vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions in the region.
11. The Proposed Plan is consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy, and contributes to increasing mobility and sustainability. The Proposed Plan will locate jobs and housing near transit

in a manner that reduces traffic and commute times by focusing capacity near transit and in mixed use environments.

12. The benefits conferred by the Proposed Plan through orderly, well-designed development that is served by existing infrastructure and services, as well as connected by transit, bicycle and pedestrian networks, outweigh the impacts anticipated with development allowed by the Proposed Plan.
13. The Proposed Plan would ensure that where new growth is anticipated, project features are incorporated to help minimize the impacts of new development. Through implementation of the Urban Design Element, new infill development will be regulated through varying levels of design regulations.
14. The Proposed Plan provides significant social and health benefits by creating more opportunities for housing. According to the Los Angeles County Department of Health (2015), housing is the most influential social determinant of health in Los Angeles County.
15. The Proposed Plan provides significant social and health benefits by creating destinations accessible by walking and biking, thereby creating more opportunities for people to be physically active while activating the street, increasing safety and perceptions of safety through eyes on the street.
16. The Proposed Plan provides significant social and health benefits by reducing future greenhouse gas emissions and associated air quality impacts through a reduction in vehicle miles travelled, and by providing policies to focus resources such as park space in the areas of the City with the least access and worst health outcomes, thereby seeking to decrease health inequities within the City.
17. The Proposed Plan would respond to the regional housing crisis, the documented need for more than 20,000 additional housing units to alleviate overcrowding as documented in the Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) adopted for Long Beach under the direction of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the corresponding increasing cost of housing in the City of Long Beach, by laying the policy framework for updating the zoning code to allow for additional density at strategic locations, thereby increasing housing opportunities.
18. The Proposed Plan is intended to strengthen the local economy by creating more opportunities for diverse and 21st century job-generating uses.
19. The Proposed Plan represents over a decade of public process and balances a multitude of conflicting stakeholder inputs and opinions. The final plan accomplishes the goals set out by the City and requirements of the California Planning and Zoning laws. Adoption of the plan is necessary to comply with state law, meet the needs of current residents, accommodate future residents and provide proportional progress toward local, regional and statewide goals.