CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT
REGARDING THE
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE
SOUTHEAST AREA SPECIFIC PLAN
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2015101075

Exhibit D

I. BACKGROUND

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that a number of written findings be made by the lead agency in connection with certification of an environmental impact report (EIR) prior to approval of the Project pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines and Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code. This document provides the findings required by CEQA and the specific reasons for considering the Project acceptable even though the Project has significant impacts that are infeasible to mitigate.

The lead agency is responsible for the adequacy and objectivity of the EIR. The City of Long Beach (City), as lead agency, has subjected the Draft EIR (DEIR) and Final EIR (FEIR) to the agency's own review and analysis.

A. PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposed Project consists of a specific plan, general plan amendment, zoning ordinance amendment, and local coastal program (LCP) amendment to shape the land use and development on 1,481 acres. The Project consists of two components: 1) the Southeast Area Specific Plan (SEASP; Specific Plan) covering 1,472 acres and 2) the conventional zoning area covering 9 acres. Both of these areas constitute the "Project" for purposes of CEQA, but are described separately below.

Southeast Area Specific Plan

The Southeast Area Specific Plan consists of 1,472 acres and includes 1,372 acres currently zoned "PD-1, SEADIP," 94 acres of the San Gabriel River and Los Cerritos Channel, and 6 acres along the southeast edge of the current PD-1 boundary. This 6-acre area is the result of a boundary adjustment between Los Angeles and Orange County that was approved by the local area formation commission in 2012, but never updated in PD-1. The proposed Specific Plan would replace the 1977 Southeast Area Development Improvement Plan (PD-1).

Land use designations would include: Single Family Residential, Multi-Family Residential, Mobile Homes, Commercial-Neighborhood, Mixed Use Community Core, Mixed Use Marina, Industrial, Public, Open Space and Recreation, Coastal Habitat/Wetlands/Recreation, Channel/Marina/Waterway, Right-of-Way /Caltrans, and Dedicated Right-of-Way (not built).

Buildout of the Specific Plan would allow a total of 9,518 dwelling units, 2,665,052 square feet of commercial/employment uses, and 425 hotel rooms. This would result in a net increase of 5,439 dwelling units, 573,576 square feet of commercial/employment uses, and 50 hotel rooms compared to existing conditions.

In addition to the required elements of the Specific Plan–such as, development standards, design guidelines–there are a number of project design features that have mitigating effects. Mobility improvements include enhanced roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian connectivity. Sections 7.2.2, Views, and 7.2.5, Special Edge Conditions, protect scenic views and require sensitive design adjacent to wetlands, marinas, and waterways. Section 7.3.14, Bird-Safe Treatments, reduces impacts related to birds by addressing the interface between the wetlands (as essential bird habitat) and urban uses. It establishes criteria for lighting, landscaping, and façade treatments to minimize light pollution in natural areas and bird strikes. The proposed Specific Plan also establishes a Wetland Conservation and Monitoring Fund (Section 5.9 of the Specific Plan) to preserve and restore wetlands and requires wetland buffers for development adjacent to wetlands (Section 5.10 Wetland Buffers).

Conventional Zoning Area

The remaining nine acres of land in the Project area directly west of the Marina Vista Park are proposed to be extracted from the PD-1 zoning designation and converted to conventional zoning. This area would not be included in the proposed Specific Plan. Existing land uses in this area include single-family homes and a fire station. The proposed land use for this area was determined based on existing conditions. This area would be designated single-family residential. No new development is intended for this area, and no physical change (e.g., additional development intensity or redevelopment) is expected to occur; all existing uses within this area are expected to remain.

A conventional zoning designation (R-1-N, single family residential) was chosen to be consistent with the existing residential development. No new development is intended in this area. Given that the existing intensity of development is not expected to change, buildout projections for the nine-acre conventional zoning area assume no change in number of dwelling units or population. Buildout projections for the area would be the same as existing conditions—39 dwelling units and 16,693 square feet of public use.

B. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The following objectives have been established for the proposed Project and will aid decision makers in their review of the Project and associated environmental impacts. The objectives incorporate the Guiding Principles established for the proposed Southeast Area Specific Plan (SEASP).

1. Implement projects within the Southeast Area Specific Plan that give equal consideration to planning, environmental and economic feasibility.

2. Balance responsible growth with resource preservation through a flexible land use plan that provides a greater mix of uses and through an implementation strategy that is tailored to the local economy.

3. Provide clear standards and guidelines to encourage future development that respects the wetlands, protects views, and creates a sense of place through thoughtful building placement, form, and architectural design.

4. Expand multimodal transportation options through enhanced pedestrian and bicycle connectivity without compromising vehicular traffic flow.

5. Provide options to increase public connectivity to open space, including the marina, other waterways, the wetlands, and parks.

6. Identify and plan for enhanced gateway and landmark locations that define the entrance to the City and contribute to a sense of place for the area.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In conformance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Long Beach conducted an extensive environmental review of the proposed Project. The environmental review process has included:

- Completion of an Initial Study (IS)/Notice of Preparation (NOP) on October 22, 2015. The public review period extended from October 22, 2015, to November 20, 2015. The NOP was posted at the Los Angeles County Clerk's office on October 22, 2015 and published in the Press Telegram on October 21, 2015. Copies of the IS were made available for public review at the City of Long Beach, the Main Library and Bay Shore Neighborhood Library.

- Completion of the scoping process where the public was invited by the City to participate in a scoping meeting held November 4, 2015 at the Best Western Golden Sails, 6285 Pacific Coast Highway, Long Beach, CA 90803. The notice of a public scoping meeting was included in the NOP.

- Preparation of a DEIR, which was made available for a 60-day public review period beginning July 20, 2016, and ending September 19, 2016. The scope of the DEIR was determined based on the City's Initial Study, comments received in response to the NOP, and comments received at the scoping meeting conducted by the City. Section 2.3, *Scope of this DEIR*, of the DEIR describes the issues identified for analysis in the DEIR. The Notice of Availability (NOA) for the DEIR was sent to interested persons and organizations, sent to the State Clearinghouse in Sacramento for distribution to public agencies, posted at the City of Long Beach, and published in the Press Telegram on July 20, 2016. The NOA was posted at the Los Angeles County Clerk's office on July 20, 2016. Copies of the DEIR were made available for public review at the City of Long Beach, the Main Library and the Bay Shore Neighborhood Library.

- Preparation of a Recirculated Traffic Section and Traffic Impact Analysis of the DEIR, which was made available for a 45-day public review period beginning February 17, 2017, and ending April 3, 2017. The NOA for the Recirculated DEIR was sent to interested persons and organizations, sent to the State Clearinghouse in Sacramento for distribution to public agencies, posted at the City of Long Beach, and posted at the Los Angeles County Clerk's office on February 17, 2017. The NOA was also published in the Press Telegram on February 22, 2017. Copies of the Recirculated DEIR were made available for public review at the City of Long Beach, the Main Library and the Bay Shore Neighborhood Library.

- Preparation of a Draft Response to Comments, which was uploaded to the City's website (http://www.lbds.info/seadip_update) on April 26, 2017. The Draft Response to Comments was

also provided to agencies, organizations, and persons that submitted comment letters through e-mail notifications on April 26, 2017.

- Preparation of a Final EIR (FEIR), including comments, the responses to comments on the DEIR, and revisions to the DEIR. The FEIR was released at least 10 days prior to certification of the FEIR.

- Public hearings on the proposed Project were held, including three Planning Commission hearings on August 18, 2016, May 4, 2017, and June 1, 2017; and City Council Hearing on September 19, 2017.

D. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the proposed Project includes, but is not limited to, the following documents and other evidence:

- The NOP, two NOAs, and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the proposed Project.

- The DEIR, Recirculated DEIR, and FEIR for the proposed Project.

- All written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the DEIR and Recirculated DEIR.

- All responses to written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the DEIR and Recirculated DEIR.

- All written and verbal public testimony presented during a noticed public hearing for the proposed Project.

- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

- The reports and technical memoranda included or referenced in the DEIR, Recirculated DEIR, and FEIR.

- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in the DEIR, Recirculated DEIR, and FEIR.

- Staff report and recommendation from the Airport Land Use Commission.

- The Resolutions adopted by the Planning Commission and City Council 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.

E. CUSTODIAN AND LOCATION OF RECORDS

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

II. FINDINGS AND FACTS

The City of Long Beach, as lead agency, is required under CEQA to make written findings concerning each alternative and each significant environmental impact identified in the DEIR and FEIR.

Specifically, regarding findings, Guidelines Section 15091 provides:

> (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
>
> 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.
>
> 2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
>
> 3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the FEIR.
>
> (b) The findings required by subsection (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
>
> (c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subsection (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.

(d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

(e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.

(f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

The "changes or alterations" referred to in Section 15091(a)(1) may include a wide variety of measures or actions as set forth in Guidelines Section 15370, including:

(a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.

(b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.

(c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment.

(d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.

(e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

A. Format

This section summarizes the significant environmental impacts of the Project, describes how these impacts are to be mitigated, and discusses various alternatives to the proposed Project, which were developed in an effort to reduce the remaining significant environmental impacts. All impacts are considered potentially significant prior to mitigation unless otherwise stated in the findings.

The remainder of this section is divided into the following subsections:

Section B, Summary of Environmental Impacts, presents the summary of impacts of the proposed Project.

Section C, Findings on Impacts Determined to Be Less Than Significant, presents the impacts of the proposed Project that were determined in the DEIR and Recirculated DEIR to be less than significant without the addition of mitigation measures and presents the rationales for these determinations.

Section D, Findings on Impacts Mitigated to Less Than Significant, presents significant impacts of the proposed Project that were identified in the FEIR, the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Program, and the rationales for the findings.

Section E, Findings on Significant Unavoidable Impacts, presents significant impacts of the proposed Project that were identified in the FEIR, the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Program, the findings for significant impacts, and the rationales for the findings.

Section F, Findings on Recirculation, presents the reasoning as to why recirculation was required under Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Section G, Findings on Project Alternatives, presents alternatives to the Project and evaluates them in relation to the findings set forth in Section 15091(a)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines, which allows a public agency to approve a project that would result in one or more significant environmental effects if the project alternatives are found to be infeasible because of specific economic, social, or other considerations.

B. Summary of Environmental Impacts

Based on the Initial Study, NOP, DEIR and Recirculated DEIR, the following is a summary of the environmental topics considered to have no impact, a less than significant impact, a less than significant impact with incorporation of mitigation measures, and a significant and unavoidable impact.

Less Than Significant Impact or No Impact

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality (objectionable odors)
- Biological Resources (consistency with applicable habitat conservation plans or local ordinances)
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (consistency with applicable GHG reduction plans)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (upset or accident involving hazardous materials; safety hazard near airport or private airstrip; interference with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans; and wildfire risk)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (erosion or siltation; groundwater recharge; flood hazard; and short-term increase in pollutant concentrations)
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise (mobile and stationary operational noise)
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation

- Transportation and Traffic (hazards due to design features; inadequate emergency access; consistency with adopted policies, plans and programs for alternative transportation; and change in air traffic pattern)
- Utilities and Service Systems

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

- Biological Resources (sensitive species and natural communities; jurisdictional waters and wetlands; and wildlife movement)
- Cultural Resources (archaeological, tribal cultural, and paleontological resources and human remains)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (emission or handling of hazardous materials within a quarter mile of schools and listing on hazardous materials databases)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (stormwater runoff and tsunami flood hazard)
- Noise (construction-related vibration)

Significant and Unavoidable Impact

- Air Quality (consistency with applicable air quality management plan; short-term construction and long-term operational emissions exceedance; and exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of air pollutants)
- Cultural Resources (historic resources)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG emissions exceedance)
- Noise (construction noise)
- Transportation and Traffic (impact to roadway and freeway level of service and congestion management plan intersections)

C. Findings on Impacts Determined to be Less Than Significant

Initial Study

An Initial Study was prepared by the City of Long Beach to identify the potential significant effects of the Project. The Initial Study was completed and distributed with the Notice of Preparation for the proposed Project, dated October 22, 2015. The Initial Study determined that the proposed Project would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to Agriculture and Forestry Resources and Mineral Resources. All other topical areas of evaluation included in the Environmental Checklist were determined to require further assessment in an EIR.

City staff later determined that a full scope EIR should be prepared to analyze all 17 environmental topical areas and associated impact thresholds.

DEIR and Recirculated DEIR

It was determined that several potential environmental effects would not result from the proposed Project, or would result but would not have a significant impact on the environment. This determination was made based on the findings of the DEIR and Recirculated DEIR prepared for the

Project. The following summary briefly describes those environmental topics that were found not to be significant with implementation of existing regulations, as detailed in each respective topical section of Chapter 5 of the DEIR and the Traffic Section of the Recirculated DEIR.

1. Aesthetics

Impact 5.1-1:	Buildout of the proposed Project would not substantially obstruct a scenic vista. [Threshold AE-1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.1, *Aesthetics*, starting on page 5.1-12 of the DEIR.

Most of the Project area's notable viewsheds are those visible from major arterial highways, including 2nd Street, Studebaker Road, and Pacific Coast Highway (PCH). These are discussed below in detail.

Other existing scenic vistas include views southward from Marina Vista Park toward the Marine Stadium and views from elevated portions of SR-22/7th Street southward toward the Los Cerritos Wetlands. These viewsheds would not be expected to change dramatically since no land use changes or changes in development capacity are planned for the northern half of the Project area under the proposed Specific Plan. Although new industrial uses could be constructed in the northeast quadrant of the Project area and could be visible from Viewshed H (see Figure 5.1.1a in the DEIR), industrial uses are already present in that location and views of the wetlands beyond are already obstructed under existing conditions.

Views from 2nd Street

Second Street traverses the Project area in an east-west direction and offers existing close-range views of the Los Cerritos Wetlands (to the north and south) and distant views of the San Gabriel Mountains (to the north and east). Distant views of the San Gabriel Mountains are already limited and would not be further obstructed since the alignment of the roadway (and related eastward sightline) would be maintained. Viewshed D, which is visible while crossing over Alamitos Bay from the Naples neighborhood, is already obstructed by commercial buildings, ornamental trees, and signage in the foreground and the Haynes Generating Station in the middle distance. Despite its proximity to the Los Cerritos Wetlands, Viewshed D offers no existing scenic views of the wetlands. Therefore, new development along the PCH corridor, allowed under the proposed Specific Plan, would not obstruct an existing scenic vista in that location. Upon buildout of the Specific Plan, Viewsheds F and J would experience beneficial impacts to scenic vistas since the plan encourages restoration of the Los Cerritos Wetlands. The proposed Specific Plan also encourages the consolidation of oil well pumps and other facilities that currently block views of the wetlands.

Views from Studebaker Road

Like 2nd Street, Studebaker Road offers distant views of the San Gabriel Mountains and closer views of the Los Cerritos Wetlands. Wetland restoration activities promoted by the proposed Specific Plan would reduce visual obstructions of the Los Cerritos Wetlands (as seen from Viewsheds G and I). Landscaping buffers required along Studebaker as part of any new industrial development to the east (see Chapter 5, *Development Standards*, of the Specific Plan) would aid in preserving existing distant views looking north and east.

Views from PCH

Scenic views visible from the PCH corridor (as seen in Viewsheds B, C, L, and K) are generally obstructed under existing conditions by commercial buildings, ornamental trees, signage, and other elements of the urban environment. Views of Alamitos Bay are visible from Marina Drive south of PCH, but these views are substantially obstructed by boats in the marina. The most generous views of the Los Cerritos Wetlands visible from the PCH corridor are found at Viewshed B where PCH crosses the Los Cerritos Channel. Elsewhere, views of the wetlands are generally blocked by retail and office buildings in the Marketplace shopping center.

Upon buildout of the proposed Specific Plan, the PCH corridor would experience the most change in land uses and building intensity, including the introduction of pedestrian-oriented mixed uses, a modified street scene along PCH, and buildings up to seven stories tall. However, the Specific Plan includes extensive development standards and design guidelines aimed at providing new "water and wetlands" view corridors along PCH (see Section 5.2 (e) of Chapter 5 and Section 7.1.2 of Chapter 7). A conceptual diagram of this concept is shown in Figure 5.1-2 of the DEIR. The block structure and street network required by the Specific Plan would introduce new sightlines that would extend between PCH and the scenic vistas beyond, including views of Alamitos Bay to the west and the Los Cerritos Wetlands to the east. Because no view corridors currently exist along this segment of PCH (between 2nd Street and the San Gabriel River), impacts of the proposed Project's implementation would be beneficial.

Conclusion

In summary, the majority of the Project area would experience little to no change in visible appearance upon buildout of the Specific Plan. Therefore, scenic views from these locations would be minimal. Scenic views from major roadways traversing the Project area would either be unchanged or improved due to 1) future restoration activities and consolidation of oil extraction infrastructure as encouraged by the Specific Plan, 2) preservation of roadway alignments that offer distant views of the San Gabriel Mountains, and 3) the required introduction of new view corridors in the portion of the Project area that would experience the most new urban development.

Finding:

Upon implementation of the proposed Project, adverse impacts to existing scenic views would be less than significant.

Impact 5.1-2:	The proposed Project would not adversely impact scenic resources along Pacific Coast Highway. [Threshold AE-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.1, *Aesthetics*, starting on page 5.1-14 of the DEIR.

Caltrans' California Scenic Highway Mapping System designates PCH an eligible state scenic highway (Caltrans 2011). PCH traverses the Project area in a northwest-southeast direction through existing residential and commercial neighborhoods, including the Colorado Street neighborhood, Spinnaker/Bay Harbor neighborhood, Loynes neighborhood, and Marina Pacifica and Marketplace Districts (see Figure 3-3, *Aerial Photograph,* of the DEIR). The eligible segment of the highway spans

from the intersection of PCH and Lakewood Boulevard in the northwest portion of the Project area to south Orange County in the city of Dana Point. In order for the highway to become officially designated as a scenic highway, the local governing body would need to apply to Caltrans for scenic highway approval and adopt a Corridor Protection Program. A highway may be designated scenic depending upon how much of the natural landscape can be seen by travelers, the scenic quality of the landscape, and the extent to which development intrudes upon the traveler's enjoyment of the view (Caltrans 2015).

Although the relevant segment of PCH is not officially designated as a scenic highway, there are scenic views visible from PCH (see viewsheds B, C, L and K in Figures 5.1-1a and 5.1-1b, *Project Area Viewsheds,* of the DEIR). As shown on Figure 3-4, *Proposed Land Use Plan*, of the DEIR, the land on either side of the eligible segment of PCH would be designated primarily as Mixed Use Community Core (i.e., Marina Pacific Mall, Seaport Marina Hotel, Marina Shore and Marketplace) and Coastal Habitat, Wetlands, & Recreation (i.e., Los Cerritos Wetlands). These land use designations would allow intensified development in specific locations. However, buildout of the Specific Plan would generally result in new or intensified urban uses in areas that already feature urban uses that obstruct—or partially obstruct—scenic views from PCH (e.g., Viewshed C facing west and Viewshed L facing east and west). Urban uses would not be allowed in areas that currently feature expansive horizontal planes of vision offering views of scenic resources from PCH (e.g., Viewsheds B and C looking east across the Los Cerritos Wetlands to the distant San Gabriel Mountains).

One notable exception is the "Pumpkin Patch" site at PCH and Studebaker Road (Viewshed K), where new industrial uses (likely an oil extraction facility; see Section 5.11, *Mineral Resources*, of the DEIR) would be allowed on an existing vacant lot. However, eastward views of the Los Cerritos Wetlands and San Gabriel Mountains from this location are already obstructed by commercial buildings and trees in the foreground and the Haynes Generating Station in the middle distance. Therefore, permitted land uses at this location would not be expected to dramatically diminish any existing scenic views.

Finding:

Development standards and design guidelines in the Specific Plan include provisions aimed at protecting existing viewsheds and promoting the creation of new "water and wetlands" view corridors along PCH (see Section 5.4(d) of Chapter 5 and Section 7.2.2 of Chapter 7 of the Specific Plan). Therefore, impacts related to state scenic highways would be less than significant.

Impact 5.1-3:	Buildout of the proposed Project would alter and intensify development in the Specific Plan area, but would not adversely impact the existing visual appearance of the Project area. [Threshold AE-3]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.1, *Aesthetics*, starting on page 5.1-16 of the DEIR.

Because most of the land use changes and additional development capacity proposed by the Specific Plan are concentrated in a few areas of the Project area (see Figure 4-1, *Areas of Change*, in Chapter 4 of the Specific Plan), anticipated changes to visual appearance and character are best described by breaking the area into three subareas: the area's existing residential neighborhoods, the commercial

corridor spanning the segment of PCH that traverses the Project area, and the Los Cerritos Wetlands.

Residential Neighborhoods

As indicated in Chapter 4, *Community Structure and Land Use Plan*, of the Specific Plan, no land use changes or additional development capacity are planned for a majority of the Project area, including the residential neighborhoods located north of the Los Cerritos Channel. These neighborhoods are built out with established single-family and multifamily residential uses. At buildout of the Specific Plan, these areas would be expected to experience only very minor changes in visual appearance and character. Therefore, aesthetic impacts in residential neighborhoods would be less than significant.

PCH Corridor

Most land use changes, changes in development capacity, and public improvements proposed under the Specific Plan are planned for the corridor along PCH. The proposed Mixed Use Community Core designation would affect the existing commercial corridor that includes the Marina Pacific Mall, Marketplace, Seaport Marina Hotel, and Marina Shores shopping center. This area is envisioned as the primary activity center in the Project area and provides for a mix of uses including residential, regional retail, hotel, and office uses. The Mixed Use Marina designation provides for residential, neighborhood retail, hotel, visitor serving recreation, and marina uses on the Golden Sails property. The focus of this designation is on creating a strong interface and connections with Los Cerritos Channel and Bahia Cerritos Marina.

Because these two designations would allow the greatest intensification of land uses—including buildings up to seven stories in some locations—and the greatest flexibility for future development, the affected parcels along PCH would be expected to see the greatest change in physical appearance and community character over time as parcels are redeveloped. However, the proposed Specific Plan contains numerous development standards (see Chapter 5 of the Specific Plan) and design guidelines (see Chapter 7 of the Specific Plan) designed to maintain a consistent and aesthetically-pleasing community character along the PCH corridor. As shown in Figure 5.1-3, *Conceptual Renderings*, of the DEIR, the guidelines have been designed to preserve the Project area's unique identity. Compliance with these standards and guidelines would ensure that any change in visual appearance along the PCH corridor would reflect the existing community character and maritime atmosphere of the Project area. Therefore, adverse aesthetic impacts along the PCH corridor would be less than significant.

Los Cerritos Wetlands and Northeast Project Area

The proposed Specific Plan contains numerous provisions that encourage restoration of the Los Cerritos Wetlands: it establishes a Wetland Conservation and Monitoring Fund (Section 5.9 of the Specific Plan) to preserve and restore wetlands, and it requires wetland buffers for development adjacent to wetlands (Section 5.10 of the Specific Plan). The proposed Specific Plan also encourages the consolidation of existing oil extraction facilities, which would create greater expanses of land available for wetland restoration. Furthermore, the proposed Coastal Habitat, Wetlands, & Recreation designation allows for limited new development, such as trails, visitor-serving recreation to the extent that it integrates with the natural landscape (Section 7.3.12 Boat Storage Facilities), and

an interpretive center ancillary to the wetlands. Urbanized land uses are not allowed in the wetlands. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in beneficial impacts in this portion of the Project area.

Although new industrial uses would be allowed in the northeast corner of the Project area, these would occur only on sites already containing heavy industrial uses. Furthermore, it is expected that proposed plans for this area would include shorter and lower-profile energy facilities that would be less visible from the Project area, reducing impacts on community character in the Los Cerritos Wetlands area. For the above reasons, impacts related to implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in less than significant impacts in the Los Cerritos Wetlands.

Finding:

Compliance with development standards and design guidelines identified in the Specific Plan would ensure that new development would be visually compatible with adjacent development and the Project area's overall community character. Adverse impacts related to visual appearance and character would be less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

Impact 5.1-4:	Implementation of the proposed Project would generate additional light and glare into the Project area. [Threshold AE-4]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.1, *Aesthetics*, starting on page 5.1-21 of the DEIR.

The proposed Project would alter and intensify land uses and their related lighting sources in the Specific Plan area by introducing new buildings (with both interior and exterior lighting), security, sign, and parking lights. In addition to necessary lighting for safety and security, the proposed Project would also introduce aesthetic lighting, such as illumination of areas within the neighborhood commercial areas (e.g., Bixby Plaza and Marina Plaza) and the mixed use core area (e.g., Marina Pacific Mall, Seaport Marina Hotel, Marketplace, and Marina Shores) for architectural and façade detailing. Additional sources of glare could also be introduced through the Project area in the form of large expanses of glazing (i.e., glass windows) and building materials (e.g., reflective metal treatments).

Design Guidelines

Future development projects accommodated under the proposed Specific Plan would likely include a wide variety of building materials and architectural treatments. However, these materials and treatments would likely be similar those existing throughout the Specific Plan area. Accordingly, they would not be expected to create substantial day or nighttime glare. In order to ensure that new development in the Project area does not generate excessive light and glare, the proposed Specific Plan includes numerous design guidelines aimed at reducing the impacts of light and glare on adjacent land uses, including those in Sections 7.2.8 (Public and Private Open Space), 7.2.9 (Parking and Loading), 7.3.2 (Materials and Color), 7.3.3 (Facades and Ground Floor), 7.3.9 (Site Lighting), 7.3.10 (Building Lighting), and 7.3.14 (Bird-Safe Treatments).

Municipal Code

Additionally, future development projects would be required to adhere to the lighting standards outlined in the City's Municipal Code, thereby ensuring that existing and future Project residents throughout the Project area and its surroundings are protected from existing and Project-related lighting sources. Specifically, Sections 21.41.259 (Parking Areas, Lighting), 21.44.855 (Light and Glare Intrusion Prevention), and 21.44.600 (Prohibited Signs) of the City's Municipal Code require that all parking area lighting be illuminated with lights directed and shielded to prevent light spillover to adjacent properties, that any electronic signs be adequately shielded and properly oriented and aimed, and all floodlights be hooded or shielded to minimize light and glare on public right-of-way, adjacent property, or other sensitive land uses (e.g., homes, schools, churches, etc.), respectively. Compliance with these provisions would be ensured through the City's development review and building plan check process.

Finding:

Compliance with components of the Specific Plan and the City's Municipal Code would ensure that development in the Project area would not produce a substantial increase in light or glare. Project-related light and glare impacts would not be significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Impact 5.2-1:	Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not convert farmland to nonfarmland uses. [Thresholds AG-1 and AG-5]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, *Agriculture and Forestry Resources*, starting on page 5.2-4 of the DEIR.

According to the California Department of Conservation "California Important Farmland Finder," the Project area is not designated Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance (DOC 2014). Thus, implementation of the proposed Project would not convert mapped farmland to nonagricultural use.

Finding:

No impacts to farmland would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

Impact 5.2-2:	Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with zoning for agricultural uses or conflict with an existing Williamson contract. [Threshold AG-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, *Agriculture and Forestry Resources*, starting on page 5.2-5 of the DEIR.

The California Department of Conservation's Division of Land Resource Protection does not show any land within Long Beach as being subject to a Williamson Act contract (DOC 2013). In addition, per Chapter 21.30 of the City's municipal code, the City does not have any land zoned for agricultural use (Long Beach 2015).

Finding:

No impact to existing Williamson Act contracts or agriculturally zoned land would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.

Impact 5.2-3:	Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or otherwise result in the loss or conversion of forest land. [Thresholds AG-3, AG-4, and AG-5]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.2, *Agriculture and Forestry Resources*, starting on page 5.2-5 of the DEIR.

The City of Long Beach does not have any land zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (Long Beach 2015). Furthermore, there are no existing forests in the Project area.

Finding:

Buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would have no impact on forestland and no mitigation is necessary.

3. Air Quality

Impact 5.3-6	The proposed Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. [Threshold AQ-5]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.3, *Air Quality*, starting on page 5.3-30 of the DEIR.

The Proposed Project would not emit objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. The type of facilities that are considered to have objectionable odors include wastewater treatments plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities.

Odors generated by new nonresidential land uses are not expected to be significant or highly objectionable. New industrial uses would be required to be in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402. Likewise, existing facilities are required to be in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent nuisances on sensitive land uses. Therefore, impacts related to objectionable odors would be less than significant.

Emissions from construction equipment, such as diesel exhaust, and volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings and paving activities may generate odors; however, these odors would be temporary, intermittent, and not expected to affect a substantial number of people. Additionally, noxious odors would be confined to the immediate vicinity of the construction equipment. By the time such emissions reach 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 operation- and construction-generated odors would be less than significant.

Finding:

Buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would not create objectionable odors that may affect a substantial number of people.

4. Biological Resources

Impact 5.4-5:	Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with any local ordinance, habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other applicable approved habitat conservation plan. [Thresholds B-5 and B-6]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.4, *Biological Resources*, starting on page 5.4-45 of the DEIR.

The Project area is not in a habitat conservation plan, a natural community conservation plan, or any other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts with respect to a habitat conservation plan would occur.

Trees in Long Beach are protected under Chapter 14.28 (Trees and Shrubs) of the City's Municipal Code, which regulates the planting, maintenance, and removal of trees in the City. Projects developed under the proposed Project may involve the removal of existing ornamental trees, including street trees. However, projects would be required to comply with provisions of the City's Municipal Code.

Finding:

Implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting trees, and no impact would occur.

5. Geology and Soils

Impact 5.6-1:	Future development within the Project area could subject persons and structures from surface rupture of a known Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. [Threshold G-1.i])

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.6, *Geology and Soils*, starting on page 5.6-14 of the DEIR.

As shown on Figure 5.6-4, *Earthquake Fault Zone with Proposed Land Use Plan*, of the DEIR, the Project area falls within an area designated an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone of the Newport-Inglewood Fault. Existing land uses with in this area include residential, church, hotel, wetlands, and oil operations.

The proposed Specific Plan does not plan changes in the residential use areas; however, land use changes could occur in the area of the church with proposed Multi-Family, the retail center (Marina Plaza) with proposed Commercial-Neighborhood, and the hotel (Best Western) with proposed Mixed Use Marina. The proposed Specific Plan would allow changes within the wetlands area such as visitor-serving recreation, an interpretive center, or consolidation of oil wells. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone passes through part of the site that would be designated in the proposed

Specific Plan as Coastal Habitat, Wetlands, & Recreation; Mixed Use Marina; Commercial-Neighborhood; Single-Family Residential; and Multi-Family Residential.

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act prohibits the location of structures for human occupancy across the trace of an active fault; this prohibition is codified in various state codes and regulations. In accordance with Section 2621.5 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 3600 of the California Code of Regulations, any Project-related structures for human occupancy would be prohibited along the fault trace. Additionally, in accordance with Sections 3603(a) and 3603(d) of the California Code or Regulations, application for a development permit for any project that lies within the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone (whether within 50 feet of the fault trace or within the overall fault zone) is required to be accompanied by a geotechnical investigation and report prepared by a geologist registered in the State of California; the geotechnical investigation and report is required to demonstrate that proposed buildings would not be constructed across an active fault and to determine whether a branch of the active fault passes through or next to the affected development site. Therefore, before any development could occur on sites that are within the Newport Inglewood Fault Zone, it would be required to obtain all necessary approvals, clearances, and permits from the City.

Furthermore, Long Beach Municipal Code Section 18.05.030 requires projects designed in an Alquist-Priolo zone, to obtain approval of soils engineering and engineering geology reports and incorporate recommendations into construction documents.

Finding:

With adherence to the state and local regulations, impacts resulting from an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone are not anticipated to occur and would be less then significant.

Impact 5.6-2:	Future development within the Project area could expose increased numbers of persons and structures to strong ground shaking from active faults in the region. [Threshold G-1.ii]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.6, *Geology and Soils*, starting on page 5.6-18 of the DEIR.

The Project area is in a seismically active region and strong ground shaking can be expected to occur during the design lifetimes of structures that would be built in conformance with the Specific Plan. The Project could expose increased numbers of persons and structures to strong ground shaking..

State and local jurisdictions regulate development in California through a variety of tools that reduce hazards from earthquakes and other geologic hazards. For example, the state regulations protecting human-occupied structures from geo-seismic hazards are provided in the most recent (2013) CBC (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2) and CRC (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2.5). The design and construction of future development projects that would be accommodated by the Southeast Area Specific Plan would be required to adhere to the provisions of the CBC and CRC, which are imposed on project developments by the City's Development Services Department during the development review and building plan check process. Compliance with the requirements of the CBC and CRC for structural safety during a seismic event would reduce hazards from strong seismic ground shaking.

Furthermore, future development projects that would be accommodated by the Southeast Area Specific Plan would be required to have site-specific geotechnical investigation reports prepared by the project applicant's/developer's geotechnical consultant, in accordance with Appendix J Section J104 (Engineered Grading Requirements) of the CBC; such investigation would determine seismic design parameters for the site and the proposed building type per CBC requirements.

Finding:

Compliance with CBC and CRC regulations and associated design parameters and recommendations would ensure impacts resulting from strong ground shaking are not anticipated to be significant.

Impact 5.6-3:	Future development within certain areas of the Project area could subject persons and structures to hazards from liquefaction. [Threshold G-1.iii, G-3]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.6, *Geology and Soils*, starting on page 5.6-19 of the DEIR.

The vast majority of the Project area and all of the proposed areas of land uses changes are in a liquefaction zone. Future development projects that would be accommodated by the Southeast Area Specific Plan in a Zone of Required Investigation for Liquefaction would be required to have site-specific geotechnical investigation reports prepared by the project applicant's/developer's geotechnical consultant, in accordance with Appendix J Section J104 (Engineered Grading Requirements) of the CBC; such investigation would assess liquefaction potential onsite and provide any needed recommendations to minimize hazards from liquefaction.

Lateral spreading is the downslope movement of surface sediment due to liquefaction in a subsurface layer. Compliance with recommendations of geotechnical investigation reports, including recommendations for minimizing liquefaction hazard, would minimize hazards from lateral spreading.

Finding:

Compliance with the recommendations of the geotechnical investigation report would be required as a condition of a grading permit and/or building permit and would be ensured by the City's Development Services Department during the development review and building plan check process. Therefore, impacts resulting from hazards due to liquefaction are not anticipated to be significant.

Impact 5.6-4:	Future development within the Project site would not result in a risk from landslides. [Thresholds G-1.iv]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.6, *Geology and Soils*, starting on page 5.6-19 of the DEIR.

Slope failures in the form of landslides are common during strong seismic shaking in areas of steep hills. The Project area is generally flat with no significant slopes. The State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Maps for the Los Alamitos, Long Beach, and Seal Beach quadrangles indicate that the Project area is not within an area susceptible to landslides (CGS 1999a, 1999b, 1999c).

Finding:

No impacts related to landslides are anticipated.

Impact 5.6-5:	Future development within the Project site could subject persons or structures to hazards arising from subsidence, collapsible soils, or expansive soils. [Thresholds G-3 and G-4]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.6, *Geology and Soils*, starting on page 5.6-20 of the DEIR.

Future development within the Project area could be exposed to collapsible soils. Additionally, ground subsidence within the Project area has historically occurred due to oil operations. While subsidence in the area stopped after 1953 due to the City's efforts and ground elevation monitoring, subsidence has the potential to occur within the proposed Specific Plan area. Expansive soils are also known to exist in the Project area.

Future development projects that would be accommodated by the proposed Specific Plan would be required to have site-specific geotechnical investigation reports prepared by the project applicant's/developer's geotechnical consultant, in accordance with Appendix J Section J104 (Engineered Grading Requirements) of the CBC; such investigation would assess hazardous soil conditions onsite and would provide recommendations as needed to minimize these potential soils hazards. For example, recommendations from the geotechnical report to address potential hazards related to collapsible soils would include removal of at least the top few feet of existing soil on the affected sites and replacement with engineered, compacted, and moistened fill soils.

Finding:

Compliance with the recommendations of the geotechnical reports would ensure impacts related to subsidence, collapsible soils, or expansive soils are less than significant.

Impact 5.6-6:	The proposed Project does not support the use of septic or other alternative waste water disposal. [Thresholds G-5]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.6, *Geology and Soils*, starting on page 5.6-20 of the DEIR.

Future development in accordance with the proposed Project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Developments within the Project area would be required to connect to the City's existing sewer lines and wastewater disposal systems.

Finding:

No impact related to the use of septic or other alternative wastewater disposal would occur.

6. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact 5.7-2	SEASP would be consistent with plans adopted to reduce GHG emissions. [GHG-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.7, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, starting on page 5.7-29 of the DEIR.

The following state, regional, and local plans have been adopted and may be applicable for development in SEASP.

CARB Scoping Plan

Future projects in SEASP would be required to adhere to the programs and regulations identified by the Scoping Plan and implemented by state, regional, and local agencies to achieve the statewide GHG reduction goals of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32). However, the Scoping Plan itself is not directly applicable to the proposed Project. The City of Long Beach adopted a Sustainable City Action Plan in 2010 that identifies local strategies to reduce GHG emissions. The Project would not conflict with the statewide programs adopted to achieve the statewide GHG reduction targets outlined in the Scoping Plan.

Southern California Association of Governments 2016 RTP/SCS

Key strategies in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) are identified in Table 5.10-3, *Consistency with SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS Goals,* in Section 5.10, *Land Use and Planning*, of the DEIR. Table 5.5-7, *SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS Transportation-Land Use Consistency*, of the DEIR, evaluates the Project in comparison to the three primary transportation-land use strategies in the RTP/SCS.

SEASP would be consistent with SCAG's regional goals of providing infill housing, improving the jobs-housing balance, and integrating land uses near major transportation corridors. Building upon the recommendations of the RTP/SCS, SEASP incorporates two mixed use districts—Mixed-Use Community Core and the Mixed-Use Marina—that would encourage a greater mix of uses. Guiding principles of SEASP include: expand multi-modal transportation options through enhanced pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and increase public connectivity to open space, including the marina, other waterways, the wetlands, and parks. The proposed Project would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

City of Long Beach Sustainable City Action Plan

The City of Long Beach adopted the Sustainable City Action Plan in 2010. The City's Sustainability Action Plan is not directly applicable to projects. However, a consistency analysis of SEASP with the applicable goals in the Sustainable City Action plan is provided in Table 5.7-8 of the DEIR in order to demonstrate how the Specific Plan aligns with other City plans. As shown in this table, SEASP would not conflict with the City's Sustainable City Action Plan.

Finding:

The proposed Project would not conflict any applicable GHG reduction plans and impacts would be less than significant.

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact 5.8-2:	Construction and/or operations within the Project area may cause an upset or accident condition involving hazardous materials. [Threshold H-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, starting on page 5.8-18 of the DEIR.

All new developments associated with the proposed Project that would handle or use hazardous materials would be required to comply with regulations and standards established by the EPA, State of California, and the City of Long Beach. Specifically, any new business is required to submit a full hazardous materials disclosure report. This includes an inventory of hazardous materials used, generated, stored, handled, or emitted; emergency response plans; evacuation plan; and a training program for personnel. The Long Beach Fire Department (LBFD) conducts yearly inspections of all businesses to ensure business plans are in order. In addition, hazardous spills and accidents are subject to the emergency procedures of the LBFD Hazardous Materials Division and/or the City of Long Beach's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. The Office of Emergency Services has published a Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan that discusses the historical occurrences of natural disaster–triggered hazardous material releases, along with a description of the current regulations, response actions, and reporting requirements for such releases in the future.

Finding:

All onsite activities, during both operation and construction, would be required to adhere to federal, state, and local regulations for the management and disposal of hazardous materials. The accidental upset of hazardous materials during construction of new developments in accordance with the proposed Project would be properly managed, and impacts would be less than significant.

Impact 5.8-4:	The Project would not result in a safety hazard to people residing or working in the Project area due to proximity to an airport or private airstrip. [Thresholds H-5 and H-6]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, starting on page 5.8-20 of the DEIR.

The Long Beach Municipal Airport is approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the Project area. The Project area is not within the airport's land use plan; it is outside of the areas where land uses are regulated for air crash hazards and structure heights are limited to prevent airspace obstructions.

The Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base is 1.75 miles northeast of the Project area. The airfield, operated by the National Guard Bureau, contains two runways with approximately 1,600 flights that arrive or depart per month. The Project area is not within the airfield's land use plan and is outside of the areas where land uses are regulated for air crash hazards and structure height (CLA 2015). Thus, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in safety hazards related to aircraft operations.

There are also no private air strips adjacent to or within the vicinity of the Project area.

Finding:

Project development would not cause any hazards related to aircraft operating to or from private airstrips or heliports, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Impact 5.8-5	The Project would not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. [Threshold H-7]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, starting on page 5.8-21 of the DEIR.

Future development would not interfere with any of the daily operations of the City's Emergency Operation Center, LBFD, or Long Beach Police Department. Emergency response and evacuation for the City is based on numerous access routes and bridges. The Specific Plan would not interfere emergency response plans or impede roadway access through removal of any streets. All construction activities would be required to be performed per the City's and LBFD's standards and regulations. For example, future development would be required to provide the necessary on- and offsite access and circulation for emergency vehicles and services during the construction and operation phases.

Future developments would also be required to incorporate all applicable design and safety standards and regulations, as set forth by LBFD and in Chapter 18.48 (Fire Code) of the City's municipal code, to ensure that they do not interfere with the provision of local emergency services (e.g., provision of adequate access roads to accommodate emergency response vehicles, adequate numbers/locations of fire hydrants).

Finding:

The proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the City of Long Beach or Los Angeles County's emergency response or evacuation plans. Project-related impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Impact 5.8-6	The Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. [Threshold H-8]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, starting on page 5.8-21 of the DEIR.

The Project area is in a highly urbanized, built-out portion of the City and is outside of fire hazard severity zones designated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. The nearby cities of Signal Hill, Carson, and Seal Beach also are not zoned as fire hazard severity zones. The nearest high severity zones are in Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, and Palos Verdes Estate, approximately 13 miles west of the Project area (CAL FIRE 2012).

Finding:

Future development under the proposed Project would not pose wildfire-related hazards to people or structures. Therefore, no impact would occur.

8. Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact 5.9-2:	Implementation of the Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation off-site. [Thresholds HYD-3 and G-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, starting on page 5.9-26 of the DEIR.

Under the existing conditions and proposed conditions, drainage patterns would largely be maintained and would utilize the existing drainage facilities within the public right of way. Flows generally drain southerly and westerly into the existing streets and are collected by a series of catch basins and storm drain facilities owned and operated by the City and Los Angeles County Public Works. Ultimately the majority of flows discharge to water bodies subject to tidal influences (Marine Stadium, Alamitos Bay, Los Cerritos Channel) or the San Gabriel River. Such water bodies are not subject to substantial erosion or siltation based on their ability to receive large influxes of water while maintaining their channel stability.

A small portion of the Project (Existing Marketplace adjacent to Pacific Coast Highway within the Mixed Use Community Core area) drains easterly towards the existing wetlands owned by the City. If large increases of runoff were to occur to the existing wetlands, localized flooding and scour could occur near the discharge point. However, the drainage areas tributaries to the existing wetlands are all built out with high impervious conditions (>90%) and any future project would have, in most cases, lower impervious conditions and peak flow reductions based on landscaping and low impact development (LID) requirements.

One exception to this statement is the potential extension of Shopkeeper Road located within the Mixed Use Community Core. In the event Shopkeeper Road were extended southerly to Studebaker Road, design features consistent with the MS4 Permit would require volume and peak flow mitigation to match existing (pre-built) conditions. Hydromodification requirements would not apply, based on the fact it would not drain into a riverine channel susceptible to hydromodification impacts.

Under the proposed condition, overall drainage patterns, flow rates and flow volumes would be maintained based on the high level of impervious condition under the existing condition and would not increase the opportunity to erosion or scour downstream. On-site storm drain systems would likely change with the individual project components but would still utilize the existing city and county facilities within the public right of way.

Finding:

Implementation of the Project would not result in erosion or siltation on or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact 5.9-3:	Development pursuant to the proposed Project would decrease the amount of impervious surfaces on the site and would not impact groundwater recharge. [Threshold HYD-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, starting on page 5.9-26 of the DEIR.

Under existing conditions, the Southeast Area Project area is entirely built out and is mostly impervious. During storm events, most runoff does not infiltrate and recharge groundwater. Under the proposed condition, the combination of enhanced landscaping, self-treating areas for water quality treatment, and permeable pavements for water efficiency are some examples of features that are required with new developments that would increase perviousness compared to existing conditions. Also, on-site storm drain systems would be upgraded to include water quality LID features which would increase infiltration compared to existing conditions.

Finding:

The Project area does not impact or rely directly on on-site groundwater supply sources and therefore would have no impact on the local groundwater table. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact 5.9-4:	The proposed Project would not place new development or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. [Thresholds HYD-7 and HYD-8]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, starting on page 5.9-27 of the DEIR.

Approximately 90 acres of the site are in 100-year flood zones; these areas are in Spinnaker Bay, Marina Pacifica, Bay Harbor, Del Lago and a minor portion of land north of Los Cerritos Channel southwest of Belmont Shore Mobile Estates. Such areas are currently developed with single-family and multi-family residential uses and parks. The proposed Project would not change land use designations within the part of the Project area within 100-year flood zones and would not change the types or intensities of land uses permitted in those areas.

Finding:

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not place housing or structures in a 100-year flood zone, and therefore no impact would occur.

Impact 5.9-5:	During the construction phase of the proposed Project, there would be the potential for short-term unquantifiable increases in pollutant concentrations from the site. After Project development, the quality of storm runoff (sediment, nutrients, metals, pesticides, pathogens, and hydrocarbons) may be altered. [Thresholds HYD-1, HYD-6, and G-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, starting on page 5.9-27 of the DEIR.

Construction Phase

Clearing, grading, excavation, and construction activities associated with the proposed Project may impact water quality due to sheet erosion of exposed soils and subsequent deposition of sediment in local drainages. Grading activities, in particular, lead to exposed areas of loose soil, as well as sediment stockpiles, that are susceptible to uncontrolled sheet flow. Although erosion occurs naturally in the environment, primarily from weathering by water and wind, improperly managed

construction activities can substantially accelerate erosion that are considered detrimental to the environment.

Prior to the issuance of grading permits, project applicants are required to provide evidence that the development of projects with one acre or greater of soil disturbance shall comply with the most current General Construction Permit (GCP) and associated local National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations to ensure that the potential for soil erosion is minimized on a project-by-project basis.

In accordance with the existing and updated GCP, a construction SWPPP must be prepared and implemented at all construction projects with one acre or greater of soil disturbance, and revised as necessary, as administrative or physical conditions change. The SWPPP shall describe construction best management practices (BMPs) that address pollutant source reduction, and provide measures/controls necessary to mitigate potential pollutant sources. These include, but are not limited to: erosion controls, sediment controls, tracking controls, non-stormwater management, materials and waste management, and good housekeeping practices.

Prior to commencement of construction activities within the Southeast Area Project area, the project-specific SWPPP(s) would be prepared in accordance with the site specific sediment risk analyses based on the grading plans, with erosion and sediment controls proposed for each phase of construction for the individual project. The phases of construction would define the maximum amount of soil disturbed, the appropriate sized sediment basins, and other control measures to accommodate all active soil disturbance areas and the appropriate monitoring and sampling plans.

Both state and local regulations would effectively mitigate construction stormwater runoff impacts from the build-out of the Southeast Area Specific Plan. The City of Long Beach Municipal Code requires standard erosion control practices to be implemented for all construction within the City.

Operations Phase

Project buildout may create new sources for runoff contamination through changing land uses. As a consequence, the Project may have the potential to increase the post-construction pollutant loadings of certain constituent pollutants associated with the proposed land uses and their associated features. Some common pollutants associated with mixed-use redevelopment include bacteria/pathogens, metals, nutrients, oil/grease, sediment, organic compounds, trash/debris, oxygen demanding substances and pesticides.

To help prevent long-term impacts associated with land use changes and in accordance with the requirements of the City of Long Beach and its MS4 permit (Order No. R4-2014-0024), new development and significant redevelopment projects must incorporate LID/site design and source control BMPs to address post-construction stormwater runoff management. In addition, projects that are identified as Priority Projects are required to implement site design/LID and source control BMPs applicable to their specific priority project categories, as well as implement treatment control BMPs where necessary.

Since the Southeast Area Project does not include a specific or detailed development plan, project-specific LID Design Plans would not be developed for the Project at this time. Future project-specific reports, preliminary and/or final, would be prepared consistent with the prevailing terms and

conditions of the City's LID Ordinance (Ordinance No. ORD-2013-0024) and LID BMP Design Manual (2013) at the time of project application. Moreover, LID and water quality treatment solutions prescribed in project-specific reports would be designed to support or enhance the regional BMPs and efforts implemented by the City as part of City-wide efforts to improve water quality.

Finding:

Implementation of state and local requirements would effectively protect projects from violating any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements from construction and operational activities. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact 5.9-6:	Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. [Threshold HYD-9]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, starting on page 5.9-32 of the DEIR.

Three flood control dams lie upstream from the City: the Sepulveda Basin, Hansen Basin, and Whittier Narrows Basin. The Sepulveda and Hansen basins are more than 30 miles upstream from where the Los Angeles River passes through the City, therefore flood waters resulting from dam failure from either basin would be expected to dissipate before reaching the City. Dam failure of the Whittier Narrows Basin, located in the Whittier Narrows of the San Gabriel Valley, would be contained within the channels of the Los Cerritos Channel and San Gabriel River and flow safely into the Alamitos Bay and Pacific Ocean (Long Beach 2004).

The nearest aboveground water storage tanks are two tower-mounted tanks on the Veterans Administration Medical Center property about 2,000 feet north of Project boundary. The bases of the tank towers are at lower elevation than the north site boundary and are in an area with a slight north slope; thus, in the event of failure of one or both tanks, water would flow north away from the Project area.

Finding:

Potential flooding impacts as a result of levee or dam failure are less than significant.

9. Land Use and Planning

Impact 5.10-1:	Project implementation would not divide an established community. [Threshold LU-1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.10, *Land Use and Planning*, starting on page 5.10-7 of the DEIR.

The existing community character of the Project area consists of distinct neighborhoods, many of which are gated and separated from commercial centers. These areas are separate from the wetland and industrial uses in the eastern portion of the Project area. One of the main goals of the proposed Specific Plan is to identify opportunity areas for better urban design and placemaking to plan for a more cohesive sense of place in the Project area. Implementation of Project would help create a sense of place by creating a unifying mixed-use core and streetscape. Streetscape improvements

would aid pedestrian and bicycle movement between parts of the area. Additionally, implementation of the Project would occur within the confines of the Project area and would not introduce roadways or other infrastructure improvements that would bisect or transect the surrounding communities. The residential and commercial uses of the Project would also be compatible with and similar to the surrounding land uses. Therefore, the proposed land use plan would not physically divide established communities, but would rather have a beneficial impact of bringing together individual neighborhoods and creating gateways, landmarks, and destinations that strengthen the Project area's community character.

Finding:

No impacts related to division of established communities would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

Impact 5.10-2:	The proposed Southeast Area Specific Plan would not conflict with policies or programs adopted for the purpose of mitigating or avoiding environmental impacts. [Threshold LU-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.10, *Land Use and Planning*, starting on page 5.10-7 of the DEIR.

Below is an evaluation of the Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies that have been adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

City of Long Beach General Plan Consistency

The proposed Project requires a general plan amendment to reflect the proposed land use designations of the Specific Plan and conventional zoning area. Some of the current General Plan land use designations within the Project area do not permit the mix and intensity of uses proposed under the Specific Plan. Upon approval of the general plan amendment by the City of Long Beach City Council, the Project would become compatible with the City's land use designations and impacts would be less than significant.

A detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with citywide goals in the General Plan is provided in Table 5.10-1 of the DEIR and concludes that the proposed Project would be consistent with the applicable policies of the City's General Plan. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in significant land use impacts to relevant General Plan policies.

Long Beach Zoning Code Consistency

Implementation of the Southeast Area Specific Plan would require an amendment to the City's Zoning Regulations (Title 21 of the City's Municipal Code) and zoning map. More specifically, the City's Zoning Regulations and zoning map would be amended to replace the existing SEADIP, Planning Development District 1 (PD-1) with the Southeast Area Specific Plan.

Specific plans act as a bridge between general plans and individual development proposals. Local jurisdictions may adopt specific plans by resolution or ordinance. The Southeast Area Specific Plan (which would replace the existing zoning designations of the PD-1) would be adopted by ordinance and would serve as the zoning for the Southeast Area Specific Plan area. The provisions in the

Southeast Area Specific Plan would control the use and development of property in the Southeast Area Specific Plan area to the same extent as if set forth in the City's Zoning Regulations. The Southeast Area Specific Plan would act as the regulatory document that the City of Long Beach would use to guide development within the Southeast Area Specific Plan area, systematically implement the City's General Plan, and help maintain consistency with and carry out the goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan.

Based on the preceding analysis, the Southeast Area Specific Plan would be consistent with the City's Zoning Regulations and would therefore, not result in any significant land use impacts.

Long Beach Local Coastal Program Consistency

The Long Beach LCP adopted the 1977 PD-1 zoning regulations for the SEADIP area that encompasses the majority of the Project area. The proposed Specific Plan would replace the PD-1 zoning in its entirety. Therefore, the Project requires approval of an amendment to the City's LCP by the California Coastal Commission (CCC).

The LCP amendment would replace the PD-1 zoning regulations for the SEADIP area with the proposed zoning regulations established by the proposed Southeast Area Specific Plan. Overall, the proposed Southeast Area Specific Plan would support the goals of the LCP by directing development away from the wetlands, parks, and open space areas in the coastal zone and towards the urban core where development currently exists. The proposed Specific Plan also encourages public access to the coastal zone by creating view corridors and pedestrian walkways to the wetlands and the marina. Consistency of the proposed Project with the City's LCP is provided in Table 5.10-2 of the DEIR and concludes that the proposed Specific Plan and LCP amendment would be consistent with the City's LCP and would not result in any significant land use impacts.

Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan Consistency

According the Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan, there are a number of short-, medium-, and long-term proposals for bicycle facilities in the Project area. Short-term recommended bikeway improvements include Class II bikeways along Loynes Drive and 2nd Street and Class III bikeways along 6th Street. The improvements along Loynes Drive and Colorado Street are part of the Downtown-Alamitos Bay Bikeway (Project #4), while the 2nd Street improvement (Project #9) would provide an east-west route to access the San Gabriel River path. Additionally, planned medium-term improvements include bikeways along Pacific Coast Highway, Bellflower Boulevard, and Studebaker Road. These facilities reflect the proposed routes in the bicycle master plan, including routes along Loynes Drive and 2nd Street. The proposed Specific Plan is consistent with the Citywide Bicycle Master Plan.

Airport Environs Land Use Plan Consistency

The Project is not within safety or noise hazard zones of the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base (JFTB). However, the Project area falls within the airport planning area and height restriction zone of JFTB; land uses within the airport planning area boundaries are required to conform to safety, height, and noise restrictions established in the AELUP for the JFTB. However, the Project area is approximately two miles from JFTB and buildings heights allowed under the proposed Specific Plan would not penetrate the 100:1 slope of the imaginary surface extending outward 20,000

feet from JFTB's runways. Because the Specific Plan would not allow buildings over 200 feet tall, implementation of the plan would not conflict with building height restrictions identified in the AELUP.

ALUC review is required for adoption of or amendments to a general plan or specific plan; zoning ordinance; master plan for public use airports; and heliports within the airport influence area (Public Utilities Code §§ 21676(b), 21676(c), 21664.5, and 21661.5). ALUC review is also required for all discretionary projects if the ALUC has not yet determined that the general plan is consistent with the AELUP or the local agency has overruled the ALUC (Public Utilities Code § 21676.5).

Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code Section 21676, local governments are required to submit all general plan and zoning amendments that affect the AELUP planning areas for consistency review by ALUC. Since the proposed Project includes an a general plan amendment, zoning ordinance amendment, and Specific Plan, and the City falls within the AELUP for JFTB, a determination of consistency with the AELUP by ALUC is required prior to the Long Beach City Council taking action on the Project. If the Project is deemed inconsistent with the AELUP, the City may override the ALUC decision by a two-thirds vote of its governing body if it makes specific findings that the proposed action is consistent with the purposes stated in Section 21670 of the Public Utilities Code—"to protect public health, safety, and welfare by ensuring the orderly expansion of airports and the adoption of land use measures that minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards in areas around public airports to the extent that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses" (§ 21670(a)(2)). If the City does not overrule the determination, but nevertheless adopts the general plan, ALUC may require the City to submit all land use actions to it for review and determination.

SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS Consistency

Table 5.10-3 of the DEIR provides an assessment of the Project's relationship to pertinent 2016-2040 SCAG RTP/SCS goals. The analysis in this table concludes that the Southeast Area Specific Plan would be consistent with the applicable RTP/SCS goals. Beyond rezoning from PD-1 to the Southeast Area Specific Plan, the conventional zoning area would not change under the proposed Project; therefore, it is not analyzed for consistency with the RTP/SCS.

Finding:

Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in significant land use impacts to applicable plans and policies that have been adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Impact 5.10-3:	Project implementation would not conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan. [Threshold LU-3]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.10, *Land Use and Planning*, starting on page 5.10-24 of the DEIR.

The Project area is not in the planning area of a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Finding:

No impact would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

10. Mineral Resources

Impact 5.11-1:	Buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or locally important mineral resource recovery site. [Thresholds M-1 and M-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.11, *Mineral Resources*, starting on page 5.11-5 of the DEIR.

There are no locally important mineral resource recovery sites in Long Beach, and the Project area is not located in a mineral resource zone (MRZ) where significant mineral deposits are present or likely to be present.

Although the Project area is not designated as having significant mineral deposits—i.e., nonfuel mineral resources—the Project area is known to feature substantial subsurface petroleum deposits. New development is not proposed that would encroach onto or result in activities that would impact the existing oil operations. Further, the Specific Plan would allow for the continued oil extraction operation.

Implementation of the proposed Synergy Wetland Restoration Project would potentially alter the geographic area used for extraction of oil in the Project area by shifting the alignment of drilling lines that access existing oil wells. However, existing wells would remain accessible for oil extraction via slant drilling, and future use of the Synergy site as a wetland mitigation bank would not diminish the availability of subsurface petroleum. The restoration project is not part of the proposed Specific Plan contemplated by this DEIR and is undergoing separate environmental review. However, the Specific Plan compliments this project by encouraging the consolidation of wells.

The land use designation identified on the existing oil field in the proposed land use plan (Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation; see Figure 3-6) would allow the continuation of existing oil production operations. Oil operations within the Specific Plan area would be required comply with Long Beach Municipal Code, Title 12, "Oil and Gas Production," and Coastal Act, Section 30262, "Oil and Gas Development." Implementation of the Specific Plan would not change or impact ongoing oil operations, including oil extraction activities.

Finding:

Future development in accordance with the Specific Plan would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource, and impacts relating to mineral resources recovery sites would be less than significant.

11. Noise

Impact 5.12-3	Buildout of the proposed Project would not cause a substantial noise increase related to traffic on local roadways in the City of Long Beach. [Thresholds N-1 and N-3]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.12, *Noise*, starting on page 5.12-28 of the DEIR.

Future development in accordance with SEASP would cause increases in traffic along local roadways. A significant impact could occur if development that would be accommodated by SEASP would result in an increase of 5 A-Weighted Decibel (dBA) although the resulting noise level is within the objectives of the City's General Plan (e.g., 65 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level [CNEL] at a noise-sensitive location), or 3 dBA if the resulting level meets or exceeds those objectives.

Table 5.12-12, *Existing Conditions Traffic Noise Increases*, of the DEIR, presents the noise level increases on roadways over existing conditions at 50 feet from the centerline of each roadway segment. The table shows that traffic noise increases along roadways would be up to 1.0 dBA CNEL due to implementation of SEASP. No roadway segments would result in an increase greater than 5 dBA or experience increases greater than 3 dBA that result in noise levels greater than 65 dBA CNEL. Therefore, traffic noise increases for existing plus Project conditions would be less than significant.

Table 5.12-13, *2035 Conditions Traffic Noise Increases*, presents the noise level increases on roadways over 2035 conditions at 50 feet from the centerline of each roadway segment. The table shows that traffic noise increases along roadways would be up to 0.8 dBA CNEL due to implementation of SEASP. No roadway segments would result in an increase greater than 5 dBA or experience increases greater than 3 dBA that result in noise levels greater than 65 dBA CNEL. Therefore, traffic noise increases for 2035 conditions would be less than significant.

Finding:

Development of the proposed Project would not generate traffic noise in exceedance of the City's noise level increase standard. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact 5.12-4:	Noise-sensitive uses would not be exposed to elevated noise levels from stationary sources as a result of buildout of the proposed Project. [Thresholds N-1 and N-3]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.12, *Noise*, starting on page 5.12-31 of the DEIR.

Buildout of SEASP would result in an increase in residential and commercial development within the planning area. The primary noise sources from these land uses are landscaping and maintenance activities, mechanical equipment, and air conditioning systems. In addition, future commercial uses may include loading docks. Noise generated by residential or commercial uses is generally short and intermittent, and these uses are not a substantial source of noise. Additionally, the City regulates noise produced by air conditioning units, landscape maintenance, and loading activities in Section 8.80.200 (Noise Disturbances-Acts Specified) of the municipal code. The City's noise ordinance is based on the receiving land use and protects noise-sensitive uses regardless of neighboring uses. Noise that exceeds the limitations of the municipal code is considered a violation and is punishable by a fine or imprisonment. Consequently, stationary-source noise from these types of proposed land uses would not substantially increase the noise environment.

Finding:

Compliance with the City's noise ordinance would ensure Project-related noise impacts from stationary sources are reduced to less than significant levels.

12. Population and Housing

Impact 5.13-1:	Implementation of the proposed Project would introduce 8,648 additional residents into the Project area. [Threshold P-1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.13, *Population and Housing*, starting on page 5.13-9 of the DEIR.

The potential population, housing, and employment impacts resulting from the proposed Project are addressed below.

Conventional Zoning Area

Under the proposed Project, the nine-acre area outside the proposed Specific Plan would be extracted from the existing Southeast Area Development Improvement Plan (PD-1) zone and converted to conventional zoning (Single-Family Residential). Despite these zoning designation revisions that would be undertaken, no physical change (e.g., additional development intensity, redevelopment) would be expected to occur within this area and all existing uses (which include 39 units and 16,693 square feet of public use) would be expected to remain. Therefore, no population, housing or employment impacts would be anticipated to occur.

Southeast Area Specific Plan Area

Housing Growth

The estimated growth in households due to buildout of the Specific Plan—5,053 households—would be within SCAG's forecast household increase for the City of Long Beach of 11,700 by 2040 (see Table 5.13-5 of the DEIR) and represents 43.2 percent of the forecast household growth by 2040. The Project is within forecasted housing growth and is less than significant.

Population Growth

Buildout under the Southeast Area Specific Plan would result in an increase of approximately 8,648 residents over existing conditions. The estimated population growth due to buildout of the Specific Plan would be well within SCAG's forecast population growth from 2015 to 2040 for the City of Long Beach and represents 73.8 percent of that 11,721 projected increase. The Project is within forecasted population growth and is less than significant.

Employment Growth

Buildout of the proposed Project would result in an increase of approximately 560 new jobs within the Specific Plan area (and the City). The forecast increase in employment is within SCAG's forecast employment net increase for the City of Long Beach from 2012 to 2040—28,500 jobs—and represents 2.0 percent of the forecast employment growth by 2040. Therefore, Project-related employment growth is within growth projections and impacts would not be significant.

Jobs-Housing Balance

At buildout of the proposed Specific Plan, the jobs-housing ratio for the City of Long Beach is estimated to be 0.99 or slightly greater than SCAG's projection of 0.97 for the City in 2040. The difference between SCAG's projected 2040 jobs-housing ratio for the City (0.97) and the ratio under the proposed Project (0.99) is negligible. Furthermore, a ratio of 0.99 is slightly more balanced. Therefore, impacts related to jobs-housing balance would be less than significant.

Finding:

Population and housing impacts of the proposed Project would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Impact 5.13-2:	Implementation of the proposed Project would not displace existing housing units or residents. [Thresholds P-2 and P-3]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.13, *Population and Housing*, starting on page 5.13-11 of the DEIR.

The proposed Specific Plan changes land use designations and allows for development in the Project area. Although residential uses within the Project area may be redeveloped during implementation of the Specific Plan, adoption of the Specific Plan does not approve any specific development or redevelopment project. Accordingly, any displacement of housing units would be expected to be minimal and incremental in relation to the lifespan of the Specific Plan. Furthermore, buildout of the proposed Project would result in a net increase in dwelling units and residents.

Finding:

The Project would not lead to the displacement of a substantial number of existing housing units or people. Impacts related to housing and population displacement would be less than significant.

Impact 5.13-3:	Implementation of the proposed Project would be consistent with the City's RHNA allocation and would offer opportunities for the construction of a wide range of housing types.

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.13, *Population and Housing*, starting on page 5.13-12 of the DEIR.

As part of the City's mandate to demonstrate that it can accommodate its Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation for the period between 2014 and 2021, the City's Housing Element includes an inventory of housing sites suitable and available for the future construction of new housing units. These sites, along with housing projects that were entitled or proposed at the time the Housing Element was written, are used to show that the construction of 7,048 affordable units in Long Beach is feasible between 2014 and 2021. As described on Page 86 of the Housing Element, specific criteria were used to identify the housing sites, including an emphasis on groups of parcels where densities can exceed 30 units per acre. As shown in Figure 10 of the Housing Element, all 31 housing sites are located in the densely-populated central and western parts of the City; almost half are along or near Long Beach Boulevard, a corridor with a high level of transit access. None of the housing sites are located in or near the Project area. Therefore, the Project is not obligated to

accommodate a specific number of affordable housing units or a precise share of the City's RNHA allocation.

However, the proposed Specific Plan would not preclude the construction of new affordable housing units in the Project area, should developers choose to pursue that type of development. Permitted uses, development standards, and design guidelines identified in the Specific Plan would allow and encourage a variety of dwelling unit types. For example, the required minimum unit size is 600 square feet and up to 15 percent of units in a project would be a minimum of 450 square feet if certain conditions are met (see Chapter 5, *Development Standards*, of the Specific Plan). Allowing smaller units provides developers a financial incentive to construct affordable housing units.

Finding:

Implementation of the Project would provide new opportunities for the construction of affordable housing. Impacts related to consistency with the City's RHNA allocation would be less than significant.

13. Public Services

Impact 5.14-1:	The proposed Project would introduce new dwelling units, residents, nonresidential uses, and workers into the LBFD's service boundaries, thereby increasing the requirement for fire protection facilities and personnel. [Threshold FP-1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.14, *Public Services*, starting on page 5.14-5 of the DEIR.

Growth in accordance with the Specific Plan is expected to create the typical range of fire and emergency service calls, and would increase the need for new fire facilities, apparatus, and personnel in order to maintain adequate response times. LBFD's costs to maintain equipment and apparatus, and to train and equip personnel, would also increase.

However, considering the existing firefighting resources available in the City, implementation of the Specific Plan is not expected to result in impacts on fire protection and emergency services. The increase in potential services needed would not require the significant expansion or construction of a new fire station. In 2015, the average response time was 4 minutes and 17 seconds citywide. It is expected that the City's response time goal of 6 minutes and 20 seconds would be maintained with implementation of the Project. Additionally, future development that would be accommodated by the Specific Plan would occur in an area of the City already served by LBFD; therefore, the Specific Plan would not result in an expansion of LBFD's service area.

The potential demand for additional personnel, equipment, and operational costs generated by the Specific Plan, would be funded and offset through the increased tax revenue generated from the additional development allowed under the Specific Plan. Individual development projects would be reviewed by the City and LBFD and would be required to comply with the requirements in effect at the time building permits are issued, including the payment of the fire facilities impact fee, per Chapter 18.23 (Fire Facilities Impact Fees) of the City's Municipal Code. The funds collected pursuant to this chapter are utilized for payment of the actual or estimated costs of fire facilities,

apparatus, and equipment related to new residential and nonresidential construction. Payment of the fire facilities impact fee ensures that individual project applicant's pay their fair share of costs related to fire protection services and facilities.

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 such as paramedic fees, fire building plan and building checks, various state and federal grants, and private donations. The additional personnel, building, and materials costs for fire services in the City required due to increased demand from future development accommodated by the Specific Plan would be offset by these revenues.

All development projects that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan would also be required to comply with the most currently adopted fire codes, building codes, and nationally recognized fire and life safety standards of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, and the State of California.

Finding:

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in substantial adverse impacts related to fire protection and emergency services.

Impact 5.14-2:	Implementation of the proposed Project would introduce new residential and nonresidential structures, residents, and workers into the LBPD service boundaries, thereby increasing the requirement for police protection services. [Threshold PP-1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.14, *Public Services*, starting on page 5.14-11 of the DEIR.

The Southeast Area Specific Plan buildout would increase demands for police protection services in the Project area through the development of approximately 5,439 housing units, 8,648 residents, 573,576 square feet of nonresidential land uses, 50 hotel rooms, and 560 employees to the Project area.

However, the increase in demands on police services resulting from the proposed Specific Plan would not adversely impact the Long Beach Police Department's (LBPD) existing resources and would not require the construction of a new police station or improvements to the existing station that serves the Specific Plan area. Implementation of the Specific Plan is also not anticipated to significantly increase LBPD's response times to either to the Project area or the surrounding vicinity. If calls for service increase and exceed the capacity of LBPD's existing workforce, additional staff would be requested. Additionally, future development that would be accommodated by the Specific Plan would occur in an area of the City already served by LBPD; therefore, the proposed Project would not result in an expansion of LBFD's service area.

LBPD staffing is expected to gradually increase as the City's population increases; the City's population is forecast to increase from 472,779 in 2015 to 534,100 in 2035 – an increase of 61,321 or 13 percent of the 2015 population (DOF 2014; SCAG 2012). Project buildout is within the forecasted population growth, and City revenues are expected to increase as population increases. As development occurs in accordance with the Specific Plan, the City's General Funds would increase

proportionally and would allocate additional funds to LBPD to hire and train additional police officers or administrative personnel. In addition, applicants of individual development projects would be required to pay police facilities impact fees in accordance with Chapter 18.22 (Police Facilities Impact Fees) of the City's Municipal Code, which would contribute to LBPD's funds to acquire, construct, and furnish new law enforcement facilities and to purchase new equipment. The funds collected pursuant to this chapter are utilized for payment of the actual or estimated costs of police facilities, apparatus, and equipment related to new residential and nonresidential construction. Payment of the Police Facilities Impact Fee ensures that individual project applicant's pay their fair share of costs related to police protection services and facilities.

LBPD would also continue to be supported by Proposition H revenue, a per barrel tax on all oil producers in Long Beach; Tidelands operation revenue; and other revenue sources such as general grants (e.g., federal, state, and county grants). The additional personnel, building, and materials costs for police services in the City required due to increased demand from future development accommodated by the Specific Plan would be offset through these revenue sources.

Finding:

Based on the preceding, increases in demands for police protection resulting from implementation of the Specific Plan would not have significant impacts on LBPD services.

Impact 5.14-3:	The proposed Project would result in the generation of 1,903 new students who would impact the school enrollment capacities of LBUSD schools that serve the Project area. [Threshold SS-1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.14, *Public Services*, starting on page 5.14-17 of the DEIR.

Table 5.14-6 of the DEIR provides an estimate of the number of K–12 grade level students by school type that would be generated by Specific Plan buildout. The estimates use student generation rates specific to Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) and are based on general citywide single- and multifamily housing developments. Student generation rates are used by school districts to estimate the number of students generated by new development in order to determine whether or not existing school facilities would be adequate for future students.

The Southeast Area Specific Plan would generate approximately 1,971 students at buildout, consisting of 948 elementary school students, 436 middle school students, and 587 high school students. Overall, there is adequate capacity to serve the Project area students; the Project in combination with current enrollment would leave a remaining capacity of 615 students. However, there may be a need for additional capacity at the elementary and middle school levels. At state classroom loading standards of 25 students per elementary school classroom and 27 students per middle school and high school classroom, Project student generation would require 11 more elementary school classrooms and 8 more middle school classrooms over Project buildout. The additional students would be accommodated by portables at the current permanent facilities in the area.

The need for additional services is addressed through compliance with the school impact fee assessment. SB 50 (Chapter 407 of Statutes of 1998) sets forth a state school facilities construction

program that includes restrictions on a local jurisdiction's ability to condition a project on mitigation of impacts on school facilities in excess of fees set forth in Education Code Section 17620. These fees are collected by school districts at the time of issuance of building permits for commercial, industrial, and residential projects. LBUSD would be able to collect these school impact fees from future development projects that would be accommodated by the Southeast Area Specific Plan, pursuant to SB 50. The State Legislature has declared that the payment of those fees constitutes full mitigation for the impacts generated by new development, per Government Code Section 65995. Since all of future Project-related development projects must pay their appropriate impact fees, each development project would mitigate the impacts associated with its activities.

Finding:

Based on the preceding, impacts from implementation of the Southeast Area Specific Plan on school services would not be significant.

Impact 5.14-4:	The proposed Project would result in the generation of up to 8,648 additional residents in the Project area, which would lead to an increase in demand for local library services. [Threshold LS-1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.14, *Public Services*, starting on page 5.14-23 of the DEIR.

Project buildout would increase population onsite by an estimated 8,648, thus increasing demands for library services. Increased demands are expected to most affect the library facilities closest to the Project area—that is, Bay Shore Neighborhood Library, Brewitt Neighborhood Library, and Los Altos Neighborhood Library. Project impacts on the Long Beach Public Library (LBPL) system would include needs for increased staffing, increased collection budget, and increased operating hours. The LBPL uses utilization of existing library facilities—such as gate count, circulation statistics, and computer usage—to estimate library service impacts of future developments. The LBPL does not expect that Specific Plan buildout would create a need for a new library facility (Rowe 2016).

Additionally, although future Project residents would be mainly served by the closest libraries, they would have access to all 12 libraries within LBPL's system. In addition, a new main library is proposed as part of the new civic center currently being planned for the City of Long Beach. The new library would likely be larger and have more resources and facilities to serve a larger population. Project residents would also have access to Los Angeles County Public Library (LACPL) facilities and resources outside in surrounding neighboring cities via a library card issued by LACPL.

Furthermore, LBPL would continue receiving funding for library facilities and resources through the City's General Fund and through library activities, such as fines, facility rentals, and passport photo/execution fees as well as grants and private donations, provided mainly by the Friends of the Long Beach Public Library and the Long Beach Public Library Foundation. Specific Plan buildout would generate additional General Fund revenue for the City, thus helping to reduce Project impacts.

Finding:

Project impacts on library services would be less than significant.

14. Recreation

Impact 5.15-1:	The proposed Project would introduce additional residents into the Project area, which may lead to an increase in the use of existing City of Long Beach park and recreational facilities. [Threshold R-1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.15, *Recreation*, starting on page 5.15-8 of the DEIR.

The City currently has a deficit of approximately 1,084 acres of parkland with approximately 5.7 acres per 1,000 residents (2,614 acres of parkland in total). This is less than the City's target goal of 8 acres per 1,000 residents. Because of the existing citywide deficit, it is possible that the existing City park and recreational facilities that would serve future residents of the Project area would experience increased use that may lead to deterioration over time. Using the City's goal of 8 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, the net increase in demand for parkland due to buildout of the Specific Plan (up to 8,648 new residents) would be approximately 69.2 acres. A total of 121.1 acres of parkland would be required to support the proposed Specific Plan buildout of 15,134 residents. The Project area currently has approximately 66 acres of parks and recreation and is adjacent to another 340 acres of parkland and recreational uses. Therefore there is more than adequate parkland near the Project area to accommodate the future residences such that implementation of the Specific Plan would not cause the deterioration of existing facilities.

Additional open space is also required for developments within the Specific Plan. All new development would be required to provide a minimum open space of 20 percent of the Project area. Specific Plan Section 5.7c (Open Space Amenities in Mixed Use Designations), sets the requirements for open space and amenities in mixed use designations.

In addition to the existing parks within and near the Project area and given the Project area's unique location along the City's coast, the Specific Plan includes the following land use designations that would provide coastal recreational opportunities to existing and future residents in the Project area: Open Space and Recreation; Coastal Habitat, Wetlands, and Recreation; and Channel/Marina/Waterway.

Further, as shown in Figure 6-2 (Bicycle Network) of the Specific Plan, a number of proposed bicycle facilities would be implemented under the Specific Plan. Bicycle circulation would be provided on streets with designated bike lanes, separated bikeways (cycle tracks), and on off-street pathways.

Per Chapter 18.18 (Park and Recreation Facilities Fee) of the City's Municipal Code, new residential projects are required to pay in-lieu fees, or dedicate land for parks, or some combination thereof. In-lieu fees must be applied for the purpose of ensuring that the parkland and recreational facility standards established by the City are met with respect to the additional needs created by such development. All new residential development that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan would be required to pay the parks and recreation facilities impact fees, which would be placed into the City's park fee account, and used solely and exclusively for the purpose of funding future park land acquisition and recreation improvements.

Finding:

Parkland dedication and/or the payment of in-lieu fees would ensure that significant impacts to existing parks and recreational facilities would not occur.

Impact 5.15-2:	Project implementation would not result in environmental impacts as a result of new and/or expanded parks and recreational facilities that would be needed to serve future Project residents. [Threshold R-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.15, *Recreation*, starting on page 5.15-10 of the DEIR.

The existing park and recreational uses within the Project area, including the Marina Vista Park, Bixby Village Golf Course, Channel View Park, Jack Nicol Park and Will Rogers Mini Park would not be altered with implementation of the Specific Plan, as these park and recreation uses would be preserved under the Specific Plan. Therefore, no adverse environmental impacts would occur.

Furthermore, development that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing City park and recreational facilities due to use of these parks and facilities by future Project residents. As noted above, all new development that would be accommodated under the Specific Plan would be required to pay the park and recreational facilities impact fees outlined in Chapter 18.18 (Park and Recreation Facilities Fee) of the City's Municipal Code, which would be placed into the City's park fee account, and used solely and exclusively for the purpose of funding future park land acquisition and recreation improvements. Payment of the park and recreational facilities impact fees would help offset any impacts to existing park and recreational facilities.

Finding:

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in significant impacts relating to new and/or expanded park and recreational facilities.

15. Transportation and Traffic

Impact 5.16-4:	The proposed Project would not increase hazards due to a design feature. [Threshold T-4]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*, starting on page 5.16-54 of the Recirculated DEIR.

At Project completion, improvements to the circulation network within the SEASP area would improve vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle mobility, and would consist of roadway connections, additional lanes at intersections, and new bicycle lanes and sidewalks. The City of Long Beach and LBFD have adopted roadway design standards that preclude the construction of any unsafe design features. Standards for provision of safe road and circulation improvements are also outlined in the Specific Plan. The proposed Project roadway and circulation improvements would be required to adhere to the City's Standard Engineering Plans and LBFD's design standards, as well as those outlined in the Specific Plan, which would be imposed on Project developments by the City and LACFD during the building plan check and development review process.

Finding:

Compliance with the established and proposed design standards would ensure that hazards due to design features would not occur. No mitigation measures are necessary.

Impact 5.16-5:	The proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. [Threshold T-5]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*, starting on page 5.16-55 of the Recirculated DEIR.

To address fire and emergency access needs, the traffic and circulation components of the proposed Project would be designed and constructed in accordance with all applicable LBFD design standards for emergency access (e.g., minimum lane width and turning radius). For example, new site access driveways and drives aisles would be designed to meet the minimum width requirements of LBFD to allow the passing of emergency vehicles. Future development projects under the proposed Project would also be required to incorporate all applicable design and safety requirements in the most current adopted fire codes, building codes, and nationally recognized fire and life safety standards of the City and LBFD, such as those outlined in Chapter 18.48 (Fire Code) of the City's municipal code, which incorporates by reference the 2013 California Fire Code. Compliance with these codes and standards is ensured through the City's and LBFD's development review and building permit process.

Additionally, during the building plan check and development review process, the City would coordinate with LBFD and LBPD to ensure that the necessary fire prevention and emergency response features are incorporated into the proposed Project and that adequate circulation and access (e.g., adequate turning radii for fire trucks) is provided within the traffic and circulation components of the proposed Project. All site and building improvements proposed under the Project would be subject to review and approval by the City, LBFD, and LBPD prior to building permit and certificate of occupancy issuance.

Finding:

Adherence to the City, LBFD, and LBPD regulations and design standards would ensure Project impacts on emergency access would be less than significant.

Impact 5.16-6:	The proposed Project complies with adopted policies, plans, and programs for alternative transportation. [Threshold T-6]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*, starting on page 5.16-56 of the Recirculated DEIR.

The Specific Plan would provide an efficient, balanced, multimodal mobility network by integrating autos, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians into a complete street.

Pedestrian

The Project would enhance pedestrian facilities throughout the Specific Plan area by providing new sidewalks, enhanced lighting and landscaping, and implementation of bicycle lanes, which would also

enhance pedestrian safety. New pedestrian connections are proposed in the Specific Plan area and offsite. Major roadways throughout the Specific Plan area will provide sidewalks on both sides of the road, increasing the performance of the pedestrian facilities. Additionally, certain locations will have a buffered sidewalk, providing enhanced pedestrian comfort and safety. Therefore, the Project would have a beneficial impact to pedestrian facilities.

Bicycle

The existing bicycle facilities in the study area are discontinuous. The Project proposes new bicycle facilities throughout the SEASP. A Class IV cycle track along Pacific Coast Highway and Studebaker Road will provide local access to Long Beach, while Class II bicycle facilities along 2nd Street, Shopkeeper Road, and Marina Drive will provide access throughout the Project area. The proposed bicycle facilities will improve overall access throughout the Specific Plan area and eliminate several existing discontinuous facilities. Additionally, because the Project area proposes improvements to the existing bicycle network, there is no conflict with the adopted City of Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan or City of Long Beach Mobility Element. Overall, the Project would have a beneficial impact to bicycle facilities.

Transit

The proposed Specific Plan is currently served by the Orange County Transportation Authority and Long Beach Transit bus services. The number of transit trips generated by the Project was estimated by multiplying the peak hour trip generation (2,555 PM peak hour trips) by 1.4 to convert auto trips to person trips (3,577 person trips), and assuming that up to 3.5 percent of those trips could be transit trips. This results in the potential of 125 PM peak hour transit trips generated by the Project. With 13 transit routes serving the study area, this would equate to about 10 riders per route. Also, multiple buses operate on most of the routes during the peak hours, and this would result in an estimated 4 riders per transit vehicle. At an estimated increase of 4 riders per transit vehicle, the performance or safety of transit would not decrease. Impacts to transit are less than significant.

Consistency with the Mobility Element

The SEASP is guided by the City's mobility element and is consistent with several mobility policies promoting complete streets and alternative transportation modes.

Furthermore, the SEASP would help the City implement AB 1358, the California Complete Streets Act, which requires local governments to plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users. By incorporating Complete Streets elements/components into the SEASP, the City would increase the number of trips made by alternative modes of travel, reducing the number of vehicle trips. An increase in transit trips, bicycling, and walking would help the City reduce traffic congestion and meet the transportation needs of all residents, workers, and visitors. Therefore, no impacts to adopted policies, plans, and programs for alternative transportation are anticipated to occur.

Consistency with SB 743

SB 743 started a process that could fundamentally change transportation impact analysis as part of CEQA compliance. These changes in many parts of California (if not statewide) will include the

elimination of auto delay, LOS, and similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion as a basis for determining significant impacts. As part of the new CEQA Guidelines, the new criteria "shall promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses" (Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(1)). Certification of the new guidelines is expected to occur in early 2017. However, since OPR has not yet amended the CEQA Guidelines to implement this change, automobile delay is still considered a significant impact, and the City of Long Beach will continue to use the established LOS criteria.

For informational purposes, Fehr & Peers prepared a technical memorandum to quantify the VMT for the Project under existing and proposed conditions. VMT calculations and reductions were quantified using the SCAG forecasting model and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency mixed-use development (MXD) trip generation methodology to accurately estimate Project trip internalization based on land use mix and accessibility, assist in identifying appropriate transportation demand management (TDM) approaches for the Project, and quantify VMT reductions associated with those TDM strategies. Detailed methodology used to calculate VMT and VMT reductions are provided in Appendix J3 of the Recirculated DEIR.

The overall VMT would increase by approximately 305,044 compared to existing conditions, and the VMT per service population would decrease by approximately 5.84 or 13 percent.The proposed Specific Plan includes robust improvements to the pedestrian and bicycle network. These measures would result in a VMT reduction of approximately 56,261, or 7.4 percent. With these improvements, VMT per service population is expected to decrease by approximately 19 percent compared to existing conditions.

The proposed Specific Plan also includes a robust TDM Plan (see Appendix J2 of the Recirculated DEIR). The TDM Plan includes a number of strategies to reduce peak hour trips by an additional 10 percent. These measures would result in a VMT reduction of approximately 126,663, or 17 percent. With TDM measures, VMT per service population is expected to decrease by approximately 27 percent compared to existing conditions. The current VMT reductions are due to the built environment variables and represent a reduction of 13 percent relative to VMT that would otherwise be generated if no trip internalization would occur. Given the internalization estimate of approximately 13 percent per day reflected in the D variables associated with the initial VMT estimation for existing uses in the area, the Project would achieve a total VMT reduction of approximately 40 percent relative to existing conditions if no D variables were accounted for (e.g. if no trip internalization is accounted for in the VMT estimates). This is consistent with maximum VMT reductions noted for compact infill developments like the SEASP area, where research shows the maximum VMT reductions to be approximately 40 percent.

Finding:

Development of the proposed Project would not conflict with alternative transportation plans and would improve the overall VMT per service population in the Project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact 5.16-7:	The proposed Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns [Threshold T-3]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*, starting on page 5.16-60 of the Recirculated DEIR.

The Long Beach Municipal Airport is approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the Project area. The Project area is not within the airport's land use plan and would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircrafts flying to and from Long Beach Municipal Airport. Portions of the Project area are within the airport planning area of the Los Alamitos JFTB. However, the Project area is not within safety hazard zones or noise contours of JFTB. In addition, future development would not conflict with building height restrictions identified in the airport environs land use plan.

Finding:

Project implementation would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No impacts are anticipated.

16. Utilities and Service Systems

Impact 5.17-1:	Implementation of the Specific Plan would require sewer line upgrades. [Thresholds U-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*, starting on page 5.17-7 of the DEIR.

Specific Plan buildout is forecast to increase wastewater generation from the Project area by 1.16 million gallons per day (mgd). The increase in flows are generally focused within the proposed Mixed Use Community Core and Mixed Use Marina land use areas, thereby potentially impacting numerous city sewer lines and LACSD trunk lines within these areas.

Project buildout is expected to require upsizing of several of the 8-inch Long Beach Water Department (LBWD) sewer lines serving the proposed Mixed Use Community Core and the Mixed Use Marina land uses areas to 10- or 12-inch lines and may require upsizing of individual Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) trunk sewers. Project buildout would require sewer flow monitoring and sewer capacity studies under certain scenarios. Any needed upsizing of LBWD and/or LACSD sewers would be conducted in conformance with LBWD and/or LACSD Rules and Regulations, certain design standards, Long Beach accepted engineering principles, and the General Construction Permit for Linear Projects.

Finding:

Compliance with LBWD and/or LACSD design standards for future wastewater improvements would ensure impacts are less than significant.

Impact 5.17-2:	Project-generated wastewater would be adequately treated by the wastewater service provider and would not exceed Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements. [Thresholds U-1, and U-5]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*, starting on page 5.17-11 of the DEIR.

Both wastewater treatment plants serving the Project are have adequate capacity to treat the increase in sewer generation associated with the proposed Project. LACSD's Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) currently has a remaining capacity of 143 mgd and Long Beach Water Reclamation Plant (LBWRP) has a remaining capacity of 11.1 mgd. The proposed Project has the potential to increase sewer flows by 1.16 mgd. Therefore, both JWPCP and LBWRP have adequate remaining treatment capacity to serve the Project at buildout.

Finding:

Impacts related to sewer capacity would be less than significant.

Impact 5.17-3:	Water supply, treatment facilities, and delivery systems would be adequate to meet Project requirements. [Thresholds U-2 (part) and U-4]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*, starting on page 5.17-22 of the DEIR.

Project buildout is forecast to increase water demand in the Project area by a net of 1,725 acre-feet per year (afy), compared to existing water demands onsite. LBWD forecasts that it will have sufficient water supplies to meet estimated water demands from buildout of the Southeast Area Specific Plan. This finding is based on LBWD's rights to a reliable supply of groundwater and LBWD's preferential rights to MWD water.

Additionally, the landscape plans of individual development projects that would be accommodated by the Specific Plan would be required to be designed and implemented in accordance with the water-efficient landscape requirements outlined in the Section 21.42.035 (Special Requirements for Water Efficient Landscaping) of the City's Municipal Code. Individual development projects would also be required to comply with the provisions of Chapter 18.74 (Low Impact Development Standards) of the City's Municipal Code, which requires the use of LID standards in planning and construction of development projects. Future development would also be required to comply with the provisions of the most current (2013) California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen; adopted by reference in Chapter 18.47 [Green Building Standards Code] of the City's Municipal Code), which contains requirements for indoor water use reduction and site irrigation conservation.

Water Treatment

There is sufficient water treatment capacity in the region to meet water demands resulting from Specific Plan buildout. The water treatment facilities have total capacity of about 2.7 billion gallons per day or 3 million afy. Project buildout would not require construction of new or expanded water treatment facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

Water Distribution

Project implementation would increase water demand in these areas by 1.43 mgd, which has the potential to impact water lines in the Project area.

The City's water hydraulic model was updated to account for the increases in water flows and verify fire flow pressures could be maintained with the proposed land use. The results indicated that water pressure remains between 60-80 psi on average and that flow velocities remain under the desired

maximum velocity of 8.0 feet per second (fps). Thus, the existing water system has sufficient capacity and fire pressure to service Specific Plan buildout. No major infrastructure improvements are anticipated.

Finding:

Water generated by buildout of the proposed Project would be adequately accommodated by the City's water supply, water treatment facilities, and water distribution network. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact 5.17-4:	Existing and/or proposed facilities would accommodate Project-generated solid waste. [Threshold U-6]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*, starting on page 5.17-33 of the DEIR.

Specific Plan buildout is estimated to generate a net increase of about 34,577 pounds – or 17.3 tons – of solid waste per day.

The five landfills serving the City of Long Beach have combined residual disposal capacity of over 31,983 tons per day. Therefore, there is sufficient residual disposal capacity at the landfills and other facilities accepting solid waste from the City of Long Beach to accommodate the estimated net increase in solid waste generation. In addition, portions of the 17.3 tons of solid waste per day would be processed at the Southeast Resource Recovery Facility and recycled or incinerated to generate electricity, or be sorted at Potential Industries for re-selling of recyclable materials.

Additionally, individual development projects that would be accommodated by the Southeast Area Specific Plan would be required to adhere to the provisions of Chapter 18.67 (Construction and Demolition Recycling Program) of the City's Municipal Code, which requires that certain categories of projects divert at least 60 percent of construction and demolition waste from landfills, through reuse or recycling. Covered projects include all newly constructed buildings; building additions of 1,000 square feet or more; building alterations with a permit valuation of $200,000 or more; and all demolition projects.

Finding:

Project buildout would not require construction of new or expanded solid waste disposal, recycling, or transformation facilities. Impacts on solid waste disposal capacity would be less than significant.

Impact 5.17-5:	The proposed Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. [Threshold U-7]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*, starting on page 5.17-34 of the DEIR.

The proposed Project would be required to comply with all applicable laws and regulations governing solid waste. Additionally, the proposed Project would not affect Long Beach's ability to continue to meet the required AB 939 waste diversion requirements. For example, individual development projects that would be permitted under the proposed Project would be required to adhere to the

provisions outlined in Chapter 18.67 (Construction and Demolition Recycling Program) of the City's Municipal Code. The chapter requires applicable projects to prepare and implement a waste management plan that includes the estimated volume or weight of waste generated, maximum volume that can be diverted via reuse or recycle, facility where the waste would be collected and received, and estimated volume or weight that would be landfilled. Additionally, individual development projects would be required to comply with the provisions of the 2010 Green Building Standards Code, which outlines requirements for construction waste reduction, material selection, and natural resource conservation.

Finding:

Compliance with applicable federal, state and local regulations related to solid waste would ensure no significant impacts would occur.

Impact 5.17-6:	Existing and proposed electricity and natural gas facilities would be able to accommodate utility demands that would be generated by the proposed Project. [Threshold U-8]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*, starting on page 5.17-39 of the DEIR.

Electricity

Buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would create a net increase in electricity demand of approximately 30.9 million kilowatt hours (kWhr) annually compared to existing conditions. The net increase is well within SCE's system-wide net increase in electricity supplies of approximately 13,400 gigawatt hours (GWH) annually over the 2012-2024 period. Therefore, there are sufficient planned electricity supplies in the region for the estimated net increase in electricity demands, and buildout under the Specific Plan would not require expanded electricity supplies.

Additionally, plans submitted for building permits of development projects that would be accommodated by the Southeast Area Specific Plan would be required to include verification demonstrating compliance with the 2013 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards and are also required to be reviewed and approved by the City of Long Beach Public Utilities Department prior to issuance of building permits. Future projects would also be required adhere to the provisions of CALGreen, which established planning and design standards for sustainable site development, energy efficiency (in excess of the California Energy Code requirements), water conservation, material conservation, and internal air contaminants.

Natural Gas

Buildout of the proposed Project would generate a net increase in natural gas demands of approximately 87.8 billion British thermal units (BTU) annually. The City of Long Beach Gas and Oil Department forecasts that its natural gas supplies will increase by approximately 601 billion BTU annually between 2014 and 2035 (CGEU 2014). The forecast net increase in natural gas demands due to buildout under the Specific Plan is well within City forecasts of natural gas supplies, and therefore, would not require the City to obtain new or expanded natural gas supplies.

D. Findings on Impacts Mitigated to Less Than Significant

The following summary describes impacts of the proposed Project that, without mitigation, would result in significant adverse impacts. Upon implementation of the mitigation measures provided in the DEIR and Recirculated DEIR, these impacts would be considered less than significant.

1. Biological Resources

Impact 5.4-1:	Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan could directly impact sensitive species and natural communities. [Thresholds B-1 and B-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.4, *Biological Resources*, starting on page 5.4-36 of the DEIR.

The Project area contains habitat for 21 special status plant species—4 of which are federal and/or state-listed as endangered, threatened, or candidate species—and 26 special status wildlife—11 of which are federal and/or state-listed as endangered, threatened, or candidate species. Additionally, several other plant and animal species have been observed through field survey of the Project area.

Buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would allow for the development of an additional 5,439 dwelling units and 573,576 square feet of nonresidential building space in the Project area compared to existing conditions. No new site specific development is planned at this time, however, the Specific Plan allows new development to be concentrated along the Pacific Coast Highway commercial corridor within the proposed Mixed Use Community Core and Mixed Use Marina land uses. These areas of change are entirely developed and do not include native habitat or other suitable habitat for sensitive species, with the exception of natural water quality features and ornamental trees.

No land use changes or additional development capacity are planned for a majority of the Project area, including the residential neighborhoods north of the Los Cerritos Channel. New industrial uses would be allowed in the proposed Industrial land use in the northeast corner of the Project area consistent with the City's General Industrial land use (LBMC Chapter 21.33) except as outlined in SEASP Section 4.3.7. However, the area proposed Industrial north of Westminster Boulevard is currently developed and infill development at this location would not impact sensitive species or natural communities. A portion of the proposed Industrial land use designation at the northeast corner of Pacific Coast Highway and the San Gabriel River consists of a vacant parcel (described above under Lyons "Pumpkin Patch"). There is approximately 0.41 acre of wetland and future development on this parcel is expected to consist of oil production and office space. Development on this parcel could result in removal of native vegetation that could support sensitive species. However, the analysis in this DEIR does not consider buildout of a site specific project on this parcel. Separate CEQA processing will be conducted for any development on the Pumpkin Patch site prior to adoption of the proposed Specific Plan.

The Project does not propose development or changes in permitted land uses in Sims' Pond or Jack Dunster Marine Biological Preserve. These areas would be designated Open Space and Recreation under the proposed Specific Plan and are expected to remain in their current uses. Uses in the Open Space and Recreation land use designation shall comply with provisions of LBMC Chapter 21.35, Park District, and any conditions that were included as part of each project's original entitlement

approval. Wetlands in these areas may be limited to the public in an effort to preserve the integrity its resource value.

The San Gabriel River, Los Cerritos Channel, and Marine Stadium are designated Channel/Marina/ Waterway in the Specific Plan. Eelgrass, regulated by NMFS, is known to occur in the Jack Dunster Marine Biological Preserve and Los Cerritos Channel and likely to occur in the San Gabriel River. The proposed Specific Plan does not propose development, dredging, or modification within tidelands or rivers that would house eelgrass. Therefore, direct impacts to HAPC (eelgrass) or other EFH would not occur.

Special Considerations - Los Cerritos Wetlands Complex (LCWC)

The entire portion of the LCWC within the Project boundaries would be designated Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation, except for two areas: the Lyons Pumpkin Patch, and the Orange County parcel, a 5-acre detention basin, including about 2.7 acres of wetlands. Future development with respect to the Lyons Pumpkin Patch is described above. No development is proposed on the Orange County parcel.

The intent of the Specific Plan is to preserve, restore, and enhance sensitive biological habitat. Buildout would result in a net increase in native vegetation and wetland habitats. This effort is being ensured through a number of project design features. For example, jurisdiction delineations are required for any new development activity in the Coastal Habitat; Wetlands & Recreation land use (see Section 5.8 of SEASP). Uses would be reviewed and designed to avoid direct impacts to wetlands and other sensitive habitats by placing development within existing roads, buildings, or ruderal upland area. The City anticipates that the interpretive center could be housed in the Bixby Ranch Field Office (6422 East 2nd Street) in the ruderal, upland habitat area of the LCWC. Additionally, trails, if allowed, would be developed on upland or unvegetated areas, thus minimizing direct impacts to native vegetation. The Specific Plan also establishes a Wetland Conservation and Monitoring Fund (SEASP Section 5.9), which will provide revenue in perpetuity for the long-term management of the wetlands, thereby protecting native vegetation and sensitive habitats.

No site specific development project is being proposed in the Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation area as part of the Specific Plan. However, the Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation land use designation lies entirely within the coastal zone and provides for coastal restoration, access, and visitor-serving recreation–ancillary office space, boat storage, trails, an interpretive center, access and the Shopkeeper Road extension. These uses are intended to be complementary to the surrounding habitat and consistent with the Coastal Act. The ultimate alignment of Shopkeeper Road shall not impact delineated wetlands pursuant to the Specific Plan (see SEASP Sections 4.3.8 and 6.6.8, v. Hearing Draft May 2017). While the remaining uses are intended to be developed in disturbed areas or ruderal uplands consisting of bare land or nonnative vegetation, development of these uses could impact sensitive habitat or result in the loss of native vegetation supporting sensitive species. For example, implementation of the Specific Plan could allow development of dry-stack boat storage on the Alamitos Bay Partnership property—about six acres in the LCWC at the southeast corner of Pacific Coast Highway and the Los Cerritos Channel—which includes about one acre of jurisdictional wetlands and sensitive plant species. Development on this property could result in a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measures were included in the DEIR and the FEIR, and are applicable to the proposed Project. The measures as provided include any revisions incorporated in the FEIR.

BIO-1 Concurrent with submittal of site development plans for development on or adjacent to undeveloped land and all land within the Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation land use, the project applicant shall submit a biological resources report conducted by a qualified biologist. The biological resources report shall include: analysis of available literature and databases (CNDDB); historical sensitive biological resources; review of current land use and land ownership within the project vicinity; on-site survey and mapping that delineates vegetation communities present within the development area; identification of jurisdictional waters and special status habitat, wildlife, and plant species. Focused surveys for sensitive, threatened, endangered species, will also be prepared, as required. The project applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed development and project design avoids impacts to special status species and habitats, in consultation with CDFW and USFWS. If complete avoidance is not possible, the project applicant shall obtain necessary permits from CDFW and USFWS. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall submit plans, required permits, and mitigation plans (if needed) to the Long Beach Development Services Department for review and approval.

BIO-2 Concurrent with submittal of site development plans for development on or adjacent to undeveloped land and all land within the Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation land use, the project applicant shall submit a jurisdictional delineation prepared by a qualified biologist or letters stating that no such jurisdictional features exist. The jurisdictional delineation shall be prepared pursuant to the requirements of (1) US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) jurisdiction pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, (2) CDFW jurisdiction pursuant to Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code, (3) RWQB jurisdiction pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and Section 13260 of the Porter-Cologne Act, and (4) wetlands as defined under the California Coastal Act. The project shall be designed to avoid impacts to jurisdictional wetlands. If wetland avoidance is not possible, the applicant shall ensure no net loss of wetlands either by creation of applicant-sponsored wetlands or purchase of mitigation bank credits in consultation with applicable Federal- and State- agencies (Corps, CDFW, RWQB, and/or Coastal Commission). Any mitigation, replacement, and/or restoration of habitat shall occur in the LCWC or in an approved coastal mitigation bank that covers this area. If the applicant can demonstrate that there are no logistically viable opportunities for mitigation within the LCWC, the applicant may propose mitigation elsewhere, which must be approved by the City and the resource agencies The mitigation plan prepared in consultation with the applicable agencies shall include: responsibilities and of persons to supervise and implement the plan, site selection, restoration and creation of habitat; site preparation and planting implementation, schedule, maintenance guidelines, monitoring plan (5 year minimum), and long-term preservation. Prior to the issuance of grading permits covering jurisdictional areas, the project applicant shall provide evidence to the Long Beach

Development Services Department that (1) all necessary permits or authorizations have been obtained from the Corps (pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act), CDFW (pursuant to Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code, and RWQCB (pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act), the Coastal Commission, or that no such permits are required; and (2) the detailed mitigation and restoration plan shall be approved by the Development Services Department.

BIO-3 If sensitive biological resources are identified within or abutting to the proposed development area, the project applicant shall submit evidence to the Long Beach Development Services Department that a qualified biologist has been retained to prepare a construction management plan. The construction limits shall be clearly flagged and/or fenced. No construction access, parking, storage of equipment, or waste dirt or rubble will be permitted within such marked areas. A monitoring biologist shall be onsite during any grading activities. The qualified biologist shall also develop and implement a project specific contractor training program to educate project contractors on the sensitive biological resources within and adjacent to the proposed development project area and oversee measures to avoid and/or minimize impacts to these species.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

Impact 5.4-2:	Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan could indirectly impact sensitive species and natural communities. [Thresholds B-1 and B-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.4, *Biological Resources*, starting on page 5.4-38 of the DEIR.

Accommodating the increased growth and building square footage from the proposed Project could result in indirect impacts on sensitive species and habitats in the proposed Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation and Open Space and Recreation land uses, which have the greatest concentration of native vegetation and sensitive species. Developments and other human activities near sensitive species and sensitive habitats can have indirect adverse effects because of noise, light, recreational use, and human and domestic animal intrusion.

Noise

Indirect noise impacts may occur to wildlife during Project construction and operation. Construction equipment generates high levels of noise, with maximums ranging from 71 dBA to 101 dBA. The ambient noise levels in the Project area represent typical noise levels for a highly urbanized area with heavily traveled roadways. However, construction noise levels would exceed the existing ambient conditions and could disrupt wildlife if they occur adjacent to or near sensitive areas.

Noise reduction measures required by Mitigation Measures N-1, N-2, and N-3 would reduce temporary construction noise impacts on adjacent properties. However, these measures would not

reduce all construction-related noise impacts near sensitive habitats. No site specific development project is proposed. However, the proposed Specific Plan would allow new development near sensitive biological resources. These areas, such as new development adjacent to the Los Cerritos Channel within the proposed Mixed Use Marina land use, adjacent to the LCWC within the Mixed Use Community Core area, and visitor-serving recreation in the Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation area, could experience substantial noise increases during construction. This is considered a potentially significant impact for sensitive species during the breeding season.

Lighting

The vast majority of new lighting would occur within a highly urbanized area and on highly trafficked roadways. As such, the overall change in night lighting in the area would not be significant. However, the introduction of new buildings with increased heights in the proposed mixed-use areas or an interpretive center in the proposed Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation areas could impact sensitive habitat and wildlife in the LCWC and open space areas.

The proposed Specific Plan includes a number of design guidelines to control light and glare from new developments. Compliance with these design guidelines would ensure that new buildings and other urban infrastructure would be designed to reduce excessive light and glare onto adjacent sensitive biological resources. Even with these measures, new lighting proposed within and adjacent to sensitive habitat could impact wildlife.

Human Activities/Urban/Wetland Interface

The proposed Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation land use designation encourages trails and public viewing areas and allows for the development of visitor-serving recreation or an interpretive center. Increased recreational use has damaging effects on wildlife due to trampling, bicycle use, and unregulated movement of domestic animals. The impact of human intrusion into sensitive biological resources could result in a significant impact.

Avian Species – Bird Strikes

Of the 26 special status wildlife species present in the specific plan area, 15 are birds. The LCWC provides habitat for a number of bird species and is part of the Pacific Flyway. New development or redevelopment activities in areas that are already urbanized would not directly impact any sensitive habitat. However, development that increases building heights near sensitive habitats—Sims' Pond, Jack Dunster Marine Biological Reserve, LCWC, and all areas proposed to be designated Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation—has the potential to impact sensitive birds due to bird strikes.

As detailed in Section 7.3.14, *Bird-Safe Treatments*, of the Specific Plan, the proposed Project requires special building treatments and establishes guidelines for all new developments to reduce impacts related to bird strikes. The reflectivity and transparency of glass are the primary hazards to birds. Highly reflective surfaces falsely imitate the sky, clouds, or nearby trees or vegetation. Sheets of transparent glass are invisible to birds and become dangerous barriers to migration routes, shelter, and food. Lights may also disorient and confuse birds by inhibiting their ability to see navigational markers such as the stars and the moon. Therefore, special design requirements have been established relating to lighting, landscaping, and façade treatments. Impacts related to bird strikes would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measures were included in the DEIR and the FEIR, and are applicable to the proposed Project. The measures as provided include any revisions incorporated in the FEIR.

Refer to Mitigation Measures N-1, N-2, and N-3.

BIO-4 Prior to the issuance of grading permits for any development, the project applicant shall include noise reduction measures to reduce noise impacts to wildlife. A note shall be provided on development plans indicating that throughout grading, demolition, and construction, the property owner/developer shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-related noise:

- During all excavation and grading on-site, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards.
- The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors (wildlife) nearest the project site.
- The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors (wildlife) during all project construction.
- No construction shall occur within 500 feet of nesting raptors or threatened or endangered species and 100 feet of all other nesting birds protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

BIO-5 Prior to approval of any development adjacent to jurisdictional waters or habitat for special status species and all land within the Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation land use, the project applicant shall submit a photometric plan demonstrating that the project will be designed and shielded so that the project's contribution of nighttime lighting shall be no greater than 0.10 foot-candles at the edge of the habitat. This would ensure that spill light does not result in exposure of artificial light at levels exceeding the intensity of moonlight (approximately 0.5 foot-candles).

BIO-6 Prior to approval of a trails/access plan within or adjacent to jurisdictional waters, the location, design, and text for urban-open space interface signage shall be developed. The signage shall be located at all pedestrian access points. The signage shall educate users on the responsibilities associated with the open space interface and shall address relevant issues including the role of natural predators in the wildlands and how to minimize impacts of human and domestic pets on native communities and their inhabitants.

BIO-7 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant and/or subsequent builder shall prepare an urban-open space interface brochure to be approved by the Long Beach Development Services Department to educate residents on the

responsibilities associated with living near sensitive biological habitat. The brochure shall address relevant issues, including the role of natural predators in the wildlands and how to minimize impacts of human and domestic pets on native communities and their inhabitants, including the "Light's Out for Birds" programs. The approved brochure, along with attachments, shall be included as part of the rental/lease agreements and as part of the sales literature for future developments.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

Impact 5.4-3:	Buildout of the Specific Plan could impact jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands. [Thresholds B-2 and B-3]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.4, *Biological Resources*, starting on page 5.4-42 of the DEIR.

Direct Impacts

Jurisdictional Waters

Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in direct impacts to jurisdictional wetlands resulting from private development, trails, or other recreational uses within the LCWC. The Project area contains approximately 175 acres of undeveloped wetlands. The majority of this acreage is protected under the Specific Plan. Wetlands within the Specific Plan area will benefit from the establishment of a Wetland Conservation and Monitoring Fund by the City. Each new development or redevelopment is required to contribute its fair share based on the size of the development to this fund, which will be created to provide restoration and long-term management to the publicly owned wetlands within the Specific Plan area. Since development footprints are not yet defined and the Specific Plan would allow recreational uses in the LCWC, impacts to jurisdictional waters within the proposed Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation areas are potentially significant.

Riparian habitats found within the Project area include the San Gabriel River and, to lesser extent, the Los Cerritos Channel and Haynes Cooling Channel. These waterways are channelized within the Project area and are not part of any allowed development. Therefore, there will be no direct impacts to these riparian features.

Indirect Impacts

Potential indirect impacts to wetlands from adjacent development could include lighting, noise, runoff, and human intrusion. To avoid indirect impacts to wetlands, wetland buffers are required (SEASP Section 5.10) to address the specific type and intensity of these impacts from adjacent development.

Wetland buffers separate wetlands from surrounding land uses that are incompatible with wetland values. Beyond providing protection for wetlands, buffers also serve a valuable function for a variety

of wildlife species because they provide habitat for foraging, breeding, and protective cover. Although the Coastal Commission recommends a 100-foot buffer between development and wetlands, the City does not require buffers in areas where existing streets, buildings, parking lots, access ways, and infrastructure would need to be removed to provide a 100-foot buffer. In addition, with scientific documentation demonstrating that a proposed development may use a reduced, enhanced buffer to accomplish the avoidance and minimization measures related to edge effects, the City may determine that a reduced buffer is appropriate; the City may also require additional mitigation for the reduced buffer. Alternatively, an increased buffer width may be required by the City under the proposed Specific Plan to provide adequate protection of the wetland values. In addition, to the Mitigation Measures required for Impact 5.4-2, wetland buffers required as part of the proposed Specific Plan would ensure indirect impacts to wetlands are less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measures were included in the DEIR and the FEIR, and are applicable to the proposed Project. The measures as provided include any revisions incorporated in the FEIR.

Refer to Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

Impact 5.4-4:	Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan could affect wildlife movement. [Threshold B-4]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.4, *Biological Resources*, starting on page 5.4-44 of the DEIR.

A portion of the San Gabriel River is within the Project area; however, the San Gabriel River will not be directly impacted by implementation of the Specific Plan. Recognized wildlife corridors have not been designated within the Project area. However, the LCWC is likely part of a migration path for urban wildlife, providing food and resting sources; some species seek breeding grounds within the Project area. The preservation of wetlands and limited uses allowed within the proposed Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation land use designation would result in avoidance of impacts to wildlife using this area as a corridor.

The LCWC provides habitat for a number of avian species and is part of the Pacific Flyway. The preservation of wetlands in the Project area substantially reduces impacts to migrating bird species in the Pacific Flyway. As discussed under Impact 5.4-2, Section 7.2.14 of SEASP, Bird-Safe Treatments, would reduce impacts relating to bird strikes to less than significant.

There is a potential for existing ornamental trees to be removed during development or redevelopment in the urbanized areas. Projects undertaken in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan would also be required to comply with the MBTA, which implements the United States'

commitment to four treaties with Canada, Japan, Mexico, and Russia for the protection of shared migratory bird resources. The MBTA governs the take, kill, possession, transport, and import of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests. Compliance with MBTA would ensure that trees and nests will not be removed during the breeding season.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measures were included in the DEIR and the FEIR, and are applicable to the proposed Project. The measures as provided include any revisions incorporated in the FEIR.

BIO-8 If construction is proposed between January 15 to September 1st, a qualified biologist must conduct a nesting bird survey(s) no more than three days prior to initiation of construction activities to document the presence or absence of nesting birds in or adjacent to the project site. The preconstruction survey(s) will focus on identifying any raptors and/or passerines nests that may be directly or indirectly affected by construction activities. Any nest permanently vacated for the season would not warrant protection pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. If active nests are documented, the following measures are required:

- Species-specific measures shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and implemented to prevent abandonment of the active nest. At a minimum, grading in the vicinity of a nest shall be postponed until the young birds have fledged. A minimum exclusion buffer of 100 feet shall be maintained during construction, depending on the species and location. The perimeter of the nest setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated with stakes and flagging at 20-foot intervals, and construction personnel and activities are restricted from the area.
- A survey report by a qualified biologist verifying that no active nests are present, or that the young have fledged, shall be submitted to the Long Beach Development Services Department prior to initiation of grading in the nest-setback zone. The qualified biologist shall serve as a biological monitor during those periods when construction activities occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests occur.
- A final report of the findings, prepared by a qualified biologist, shall be submitted to the Long Beach Development Services Department prior to construction-related activities that have the potential to disturb any active nests during the nesting season.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measure above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measure is feasible, and the measure is therefore adopted.

2. Cultural Resources

Impact 5.5-2:	Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan could impact archaeological, tribal cultural and paleontological resources. [Thresholds C-2, C-3, and C-5]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.5, *Cultural Resources*, starting on page 5.5-20 of the DEIR.

Archeological Resources

Development of projects pursuant to the proposed Specific Plan, including infrastructure improvements, could impact known archaeological sites. The record search documented six known archaeological sites within the Project area. Locations of archaeological sites in each site are kept confidential due to their sensitive nature. The Project area is considered highly sensitive for archaeological resources.

The vast majority of the Project area is built out. However, development on vacant parcels or redevelopment of taller buildings (the proposed Specific Plan allows up to seven stories in some locations) could involve ground disturbance to greater depths and previously disturbed areas. For example, development of underground parking may result in excavations that unearth unknown archeological resources. Since ground disturbance has the potential to uncover archeological resources, this is considered a potentially significant impact.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Tribal cultural resources are sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either eligible or listed in the California Register of Historic Resources or local register of historical resources (Public Resources Code Section 21074).

Native American consultation was conducted for the Project and included a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and consultations pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 18 and Assembly Bill (AB) 52. A summary of the consultation process was provided in a Technical Memorandum entitled "SEASP Native American Consultation" dated November 15, 2016.

One site was documented in in the NAHC's SLF search, and tribal representatives from four tribes—two Juaneno representatives and two Gabrielino representatives—responded indicating the Project area has the potential to yield cultural resources.

Per SB 18 and AB 52, the City received a list of tribal contacts from the NAHC consisting of 10 tribal representatives. Of the 10 local Native American representatives contacted via letters, the City received responses from the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians Kizh Nation. The Soboba representative requested a tribal monitor during any future ground disturbing activities along with archaeological surveys and testing and deferred to Gabrieleño tribal consultants for monitoring. The Gabrieleño representative indicated that the Project lies where the traditional territories of the Kizh and Gabrieleño villages adjoined and overlapped during the Late Prehistoric and Protohistoric periods. Due to the sensitivity of the area, a certified Native American

monitor was requested during all ground disturbing activities. Overall, new development or redevelopment in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan may uncover tribal cultural resources and is a potentially significant impact.

Paleontological Resources

Several vertebrate fossil localities have been discovered in the southern part of the City of Long Beach, including one in the Project area. The entire Project area is considered sensitive for paleontological resources, and the older Quaternary alluvial deposits have the potential to yield fossils. Specific Plan buildout would entail development and redevelopment within the Project area. Grading and excavations deeper than the existing development areas and previously disturbed areas have the potential to impact significant fossils. This is a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measures were included in the DEIR and the FEIR, and are applicable to the proposed Project. The measures as provided include any revisions incorporated in the FEIR.

CUL-3 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, and for any subsequent permit involving excavation to increased depth, the project applicant for each development or redevelopment project considered for approval pursuant to the Southeast Area Specific Plan shall provide letters to the City of Long Beach from a qualified archaeologist and paleontologist (for excavations five feet below ground surface and deeper) who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. The letters shall state that the project applicant has retained these individuals, and that the archaeological consultant will be present during all grading in previously undisturbed areas and other significant ground-disturbing activities and that the paleontological consultant will be present during all grading that occurs below 5 feet from the ground surface. In the event archeological or paleontological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, the professional archeological or paleontological monitor shall have the authority to halt any activities adversely impacting potentially significant cultural resources until they can be formally evaluated. Suspension of ground disturbances in the vicinity of the discoveries shall not be lifted until the archaeological and/or paleontological monitor, in coordination with the construction contractor, has evaluated discoveries to assess whether they are significant cultural resources, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). If significance criteria are met, then the project shall be required to perform data recovery, professional identification, radiocarbon dates as applicable, and other special studies. The resources shall be offered for curation or preservation to a repository with a retrievable collection system and an educational and research interest in the materials, such as the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History or California State University, Fullerton, or other local museum or repository. If no museum or repository is willing to accept the resource, the resource shall be considered the property of the City and may be stored, disposed of, transferred, exchanged, or otherwise handled by the City at its discretion.

CUL-4 At least 30 days prior to ground disturbance by each project development or redevelopment in conformance with the Specific Plan, the City of Long Beach would

notify the three Native American tribal representatives who requested Native American monitoring of ground-disturbing activities (Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians Kizh Nation, Gabrieleño/Tongva Band of Mission Indians, and Juaneño Band of Mission Indians Acjachemen Nation). For each project, the project applicant would retain one certified Native American monitor who would accompany the professional archaeological monitor during on-call monitoring. The Native American monitor would have the same authority to halt activities that could adversely impact archaeological or tribal cultural resources that the professional archaeological monitor would. The Native American monitor would recommend measures to avoid, preserve and/or recover Native American archaeological and/or tribal cultural resources, as practicable, and would convey such resources to the pertinent tribe or most likely descendant, as applicable.

CUL-5 Any development that is proposed on undeveloped or vacant land shall prepare a Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation prior to the issuance of grading permits. The cultural report shall be prepared by a qualified archeologist consistent with the most recent standards and guidelines. The report shall set forth criteria for evaluating the significance of resources discovered during construction and identify appropriate data recovery methods and procedures to mitigate project impacts on significant resources. At a minimum, the report shall include a summary of available information on known sites and sensitive locations in the project area; a historical context for the evaluation of resources that may be encountered during construction; data requirements and the appropriate field and laboratory methods to be used to acquire data needed for significance evaluation and impact mitigation. The report will also identify specific locations where cultural resources monitors would be required during grading and identify reporting and curating requirements for artifacts uncovered during construction.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

Impact 5.5-3: Grading activities could encounter unknown human remains. [Threshold C-4]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.5, *Cultural Resources*, starting on page 5.5-21 of the DEIR.

The Project area is considered archeologically sensitive, and the prehistoric background has indicated that the area was occupied by Native Americans. One tribal representative indicated that there is the potential for human burials within the Project area. Therefore, ground disturbance by projects developed pursuant to the proposed Specific Plan could encounter human remains. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan could disturb human remains, include those interred outside of formal cemeteries, and impacts are potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measures were included in the DEIR and the FEIR, and are applicable to the proposed Project. The measures as provided include any revisions incorporated in the FEIR.

CUL-6 If human remains are encountered during construction excavation and grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to Public Resources Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the NAHC. The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the most likely descendent of the deceased Native American, who will then help determine what course of action should be taken in dealing with the remains. Preservation of the remains in place or project design alternatives shall be considered.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

3. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact 5.8-1:	The proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, but may emit or handle hazardous substances within a quarter mile of schools. [Thresholds H-1 and H-3]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, starting on page 5.8-12 of the DEIR.

Following is a discussion of the proposed Project's potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment within the Project area through the accidental release of hazardous materials during the operational and construction phases of future development projects that would be accommodated by the proposed Project. Impacts to the public include impacts to schools in the Project area. Kettering Elementary School is on the north side of the Project area in the University Park Estates residential neighborhood. The school is located approximately 700 feet west of industrial land uses across Studebaker Road, Los Cerritos Channel, and Channel View Park. Other schools within one-quarter mile of the Project area include Rodgers Middle School, adjacent to the west of the Project area, and Lowell Elementary School, about 700 feet southwest of the Project area.

Project Operation

The use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials by future residents and commercial and industrial tenants/owners of the proposed Project would be required to comply with existing regulations of several agencies, including the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, California Division of Occupational Safety and Health, California Department of Transportation, County of Los Angeles Department of Environmental

Health, and LBFD. Regulations that would be required of those uses that involve transporting, using, or disposing of hazardous materials include the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), which provides the "cradle to grave" regulation of hazardous wastes; Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), which regulates closed and abandoned hazardous waste sites; the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, which governs hazardous materials transportation on U.S. roadways; International Fire Code (IFC), which creates procedures and mechanisms to ensure the safe handling and storage of hazardous materials; CCR Title 22, which regulates the generation, transportation, treatment, storage and disposal of hazardous waste; and CCR Title 27, which regulates the treatment, storage, and disposal of solid wastes. For development in California, Government Code Section 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Sections 25500 through 25520.

LBFD and Long Beach Bureau of Environmental Health (BEH) jointly function as the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for the City, and are responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 (Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory) of the Health and Safety Code. As the CUPA, LBFD and BEH are required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk-management plans. Compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner and would minimize the potential for safety impacts.

Project Construction

Construction activities of the proposed Project would involve the use of larger amounts of hazardous materials than would Project operation. Construction activities would include the use of materials such as fuels, lubricants, and greases in construction equipment and coatings used in construction. However, the materials used would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety hazard. These activities would also be short term or one time in nature. Project construction workers would be trained in safe handling and hazardous materials use.

Additionally, as with Project operation, the use, storage, transport, and disposal of construction-related hazardous materials and waste would be required to conform to existing laws and regulations. Compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner and would minimize the potential for safety impacts to occur. For example, all spills or leakage of petroleum products during construction activities are required to be immediately contained, the hazardous material identified, and the material remediated in compliance with applicable state and local regulations for the cleanup and disposal of that contaminant. All contaminated waste encountered would be required to be collected and disposed of at an appropriately licensed disposal or treatment facility.

Furthermore, strict adherence to all emergency response plan requirements set forth by the City of Long Beach and LBFD would be required through the duration of the Project construction. Therefore, hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use of hazardous

materials during Project construction would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Grading Activities

Grading activities of the development projects that would be allowed by the Southeast Area Specific Plan would involve the disturbance of onsite soils. Soils on certain parcels of the Project area could be contaminated with hazardous materials due to current and historical oil operations, power plants, former landfills, and other commercial land uses. The transport of these materials and exposure to contaminated soils of workers and the surrounding environment could result in a significant impact. Any contaminated soils encountered on individual development sites would be required to be removed prior to grading activities and disposed of offsite in accordance with all applicable regulatory guidelines.

However, to ensure that impacts from potential contaminated soils do not occur, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 has been provided at the end of this section. Per Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, project applicants are required to submit a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prior to the issuance of grading permits; the ESA would identify any potential environmental conditions of a development site and determine whether contamination is present. Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 is provided to ensure that unknown hazardous materials discovered during grading are properly handled.

Therefore, with adherence to existing regulations and implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, impacts arising from the potential of encountering contaminated soils onsite during Project grading activities would not occur. Compliance with existing regulations and this mitigation measure would be ensured through the City's development review and building plan check process.

Demolition Activities

Due to the age of the buildings and structures through the Specific Plan area, it is likely that asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paints (LBP), as well as other building materials containing lead (e.g., ceramic tile), were used in their construction. Demolition of these building and structures can cause encapsulated ACM (if present) to become friable and, once airborne, they are considered a carcinogen. Abatement of all ACM and LBP encountered during any future building demolition activities would be required to be conducted in accordance with all applicable state and local regulations.

However, to further prevent impacts from the potential release of ACM or LBP associated with individual development projects under the proposed Specific Plan, an ACM and LBP survey of existing buildings and structures would be required prior to any demolition activities, as outlined in Mitigation Measure HAZ-3. Therefore, with compliance of all applicable laws and regulations and implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-3, hazardous impacts related to the release of ACMs and LBP would not occur. Compliance with these laws, regulations, and Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3 would be ensured through the City's development review and building plan check process.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measures were included in the DEIR and the FEIR, and are applicable to the proposed Project. The measures as provided include any revisions incorporated in the FEIR.

HAZ-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits for individual development projects within the Southeast Area Specific Plan, the project applicant/developer shall submit a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to the City of Long Beach Development Services Department to identify environmental conditions of the development site and determine whether contamination is present. The Phase I ESA shall be prepared by an Environmental Professional in accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard E 1527.13, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process. If recognized environmental conditions related to soils or groundwater are identified in the Phase I ESA, the project applicant shall perform soil and soil gas sampling, as required, as a part of a Phase II ESA. If contamination is found at significant levels, the project applicant shall remediate all contaminated soils with the oversight and in accordance with state and local agency requirements (California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Long Beach Fire Department, etc.). All contaminated soils and/or material encountered shall be disposed of at a regulated site and in accordance with applicable laws and regulations prior to the completion of grading. Prior to the issuance of building permits, a report documenting the completion, results, and any follow-up remediation on the recommendations, if any, shall be provided to the City of Long Beach Development Services Department evidencing that all site remediation activities have been completed.

HAZ-2 If soil is encountered during Project area development that is suspected of being impacted by hazardous materials, work at the subject construction activity area shall be halted, and the suspect site conditions shall be evaluated by a qualified environmental professional. The results of the evaluation shall be submitted to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), or the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or other applicable oversight agency, as appropriate, and the necessary response/remedial measures shall be implemented—as directed by DTSC, RWQCB, or other applicable oversight agency—until all specified requirements of the oversight agencies are satisfied and a no further action status is attained.

HAZ-3 Prior to the issuance of demolition permits for any buildings or structures, the project applicant/developer shall conduct the following inspections and assessments for all buildings and structures onsite and shall provide the City of Long Beach Development Services Department with a copy of the report of each investigation or assessment.

- The project applicant shall retain a California Certified Asbestos Consultant (CAC) to perform abatement project planning, monitoring (including air monitoring), oversight, and reporting of all asbestos-containing materials (ACM) encountered. The abatement, containment, and disposal of all ACM shall be conducted in accordance with the South Coast Air Quality Management

District's Rule 1403 and California Code of Regulation Title 8, Section 1529 (Asbestos).

- The project applicant shall retain a licensed or certified lead inspector/assessor to conduct the abatement, containment, and disposal of all lead waste encountered. The contracted lead inspector/assessor shall be certified by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH). All lead abatement shall be performed by a CDPH-certified lead supervisor or a CDPH-certified worker under the direct supervision of a lead supervisor certified by CDPH. The abatement, containment, and disposal of all lead waste encountered shall be conducted in accordance with the US Occupational Safety and Health Administration Rule 29; CFR Part 1926; and California Code of Regulation, Title 8, Section 1532.1 (Lead).
- Evidence of the contracted professionals attained by the project applicant shall be provided to the City of Long Beach Development Services Department. Additionally, contractors performing ACM and lead waste removal shall provide evidence of abatement activities to the City of Long Beach Building and Safety Bureau.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

Impact 5.8-3:	Development within the Project area may result in hazardous materials impacts for sites that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites. [Threshold H-4]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, starting on page 5.8-19 of the DEIR.

There are a number of sites and facilities in the Project area that are listed in hazardous materials sites databases. Eighty Emergency Response Notification System (ERNS) sites were identified in the Project area. ERNS sites are for the reported releases of oil and hazardous substances. Seventeen facilities were identified as having permitted underground storage tanks, which have the potential to impact soil and groundwater. Five facilities were identified with leaking underground storage tanks (LUSTs). Ten facilities were identified as being Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Large Quantity Generators, and 19 facilities were identified as RCRA Small Quantity Generators. These sites store and generate hazardous materials. One facility was identified as a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) site within the wetlands area due to PCBs and was reportedly remediated. Additionally, the Los Angeles County Haynes generating plant and AES Los Alamitos Plant have operated within the Project area for over 50 years. These facilities have potential for impacted soil and groundwater.

Due to the fact that there are numerous sites within and in proximity of the Project area that have been listed in a hazardous materials database, the potential for impacts exists from hazardous

substance contamination. Individual development projects that would be allowed under the Southeast Area Specific Plan could impact areas of hazardous substance contamination existing or remaining from historical operations, resulting in a significant impact on the environment. Impacting these areas may also pose a significant health risk to existing and future residents and/or workers.

Hazardous substance contaminated properties are regulated at the federal, state, and local level, and are subject to compliance with stringent laws and regulations for investigation and remediation. For example, compliance with the CERCLA, RCRA, California Code of Regulations Title 22, and related requirements would remedy any potential impacts caused by hazardous substance contamination. Future development would be required to comply with these existing laws and regulations. In addition, mitigation is required to complete a Phase I ESA and potentially a Phase II ESA on identified sites and to remediate any affected contaminated sites prior to construction.

Mitigation Measure:

Refer to Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

4. Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact 5.9-1:	Implementation of the Specific Plan would decrease the amount of impervious surfaces in the Project area and would therefore decrease surface water flows into drainage systems within the watershed. [Thresholds HYD-4, HYD-5(part), and U-3]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, starting on page 5.9-23 of the DEIR.

Buildout of the Project would reduce the amount of impervious surfaces by approximately four acres. Since the impervious surfaces would be reduced, the existing and planned City and county storm drain systems are not anticipated to change as a result of the proposed Project. Therefore, the planned storm drain improvements considered in the 2005 Master Plan of Drainage Update are applicable to support proposed conditions and the Project would not require the construction of new or expanded storm drainage systems. Four of the five drainage improvements in the Master Plan are in public roadways. Installation of the four drainage improvements in roadways would disturb soil that has been previously disturbed by construction of the roadways and other utilities. The remaining improvement, Segment 220805, is partly under the northeast edge of Sims Pond, a man-made freshwater pond at the northeast corner of Pacific Coast Highway and Loynes Drive. Installation of storm drain segment 220805 could disturb some vegetated area near the edge of Sims Pond. These impacts were fully analyzed in Section 5.4, *Biological Resources*, of this DEIR and would be mitigated to less than significant (see Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3).

In order to ensure the implementation of the required storm drain improvements, all individual projects will require site specific hydrology and hydraulic studies of the on-site and immediate off-site storm drain systems to determine capacity and integrity of the existing systems prior to approval by Long Beach Public Works (see Mitigation Measure HYD-1 and HYD-2). In addition, future site specific projects that connect to a Los Angeles County storm drain are required to meet Los Angeles County Public Works requirements (citation), which establishes "allowable discharge rates" that limit peak flow discharges from existing conditions based on regional flood control constraints (see Mitigation Measure HYD-3). Further, the incorporation of LID BMPs within each site specific project will be required to provide water quality treatment and runoff reduction and/or detention in accordance with local stormwater permit requirements (see Mitigation Measure HYD-4). Implementation of LID will also serve to minimize increases in runoff.

Flooding Impacts

Specific Plan buildout would not result in an increase of peak flow runoff or volume. The on-site storm drain systems would be designed to safely collect and convey the 10-year flood while protecting all proposed buildings, structures and public safety from the 50-year flood event. Further flow rate restrictions may apply based on site specific discharge limits issued by Los Angeles County Public Works which would serve to further reduce peak flows well below existing conditions. Impacts related to increases in rate and volume of runoff are less than significant.

In the event Shopkeeper Road were extended southerly to Studebaker Road, design measures – that may include bioswales, bioretention landscaping and permeable pavement – would be incorporated to control surface runoff that would reduce impacts related to flooding and water quality. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measures were included in the DEIR and the FEIR, and are applicable to the proposed Project. The measures as provided include any revisions incorporated in the FEIR.

Refer to Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3.

HYD-1 Prior to the issuance of permits for any development or redevelopment projects pursuant to the Southeast Area Specific Plan, the City of Long Beach shall ensure that the following drainage improvements are fully funded for and implemented:

- Any development or redevelopment project that would impact existing storm drain facilities within the Southeast Area Specific Plan area (public and private) that is less than 24-inches in size shall fully fund upsizing of such facilities to a minimum 24-inch or greater pipe size as prescribed by City of Long Beach Public Works Department.
- Any development or redevelopment project that would impact the four segments of City of Long Beach's storm drains in Pacific Coast Highway for which improvements were recommended by the 2005 Master Plan of Drainage Update shall fully fund upsizing of those storm drain segments as indicated

below or other final size as prescribed by City of Long Beach Public Works Department.

- Segments 220835 and 220015 to 30 inches;
- Segment 220805 to 54 inches;
- Segment 220710 to 84 inches.

- Any development or redevelopment project that would impact the four segments of City of Long Beach's storm drains in Seville Way (Segment 220810) for which improvements were recommended by the 2005 Master Plan of Drainage Update shall fully fund upsizing of that storm drain segment to 48 inches or other final size as prescribed by City of Long Beach Public Works Department

HYD-2 Prior to the issuance of grading permits for any development or redevelopment projects pursuant to the Southeast Area Specific Plan, project applicants/developers of such projects shall prepare a site-specific hydrology and hydraulic study of the on-site and immediate off-site storm drain systems to determine capacity and integrity of the existing systems. The hydrology and hydraulic study shall be submitted to City of Long Beach Public Works Department for review and approval.

HYD-3 The project applicant/developer of each development or redevelopment project that would be accommodated by the Southeast Area Specific Plan shall request the "allowable discharge rate" – which limits peak flow discharges as compared to existing conditions based on regional flood control constraints – from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, and shall comply with such discharge rate. Compliance with the "allowable discharge rate" shall be demonstrated in the hydrology and hydraulic study to be completed pursuant to Mitigation Measure HYD-2.

HYD-4 The project applicant/developer, architect, and construction contractor for each development or redevelopment project that would be accommodated by the Southeast Area Specific Plan shall incorporate low-impact development (LID) best management practices (BMPs) within the respective project, providing for water quality treatment and runoff reduction and/or detention in accordance with local stormwater permit requirements.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

Impact 5.9-7:	The Project area is not subject to flood hazards due to seiche or mudflow. Most of the Project area is in tsunami flood zones; Specific Plan buildout would not exacerbate existing tsunami flood hazards. [Threshold HYD-10]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, starting on page 5.9-33 of the DEIR.

Mudflows

A mudflow is a landslide composed of saturated rock debris and soil with a consistency of wet cement. Mudflow would not be a potential risk given the Project area's flat landscape. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Seiche

A seiche is a surface wave created when a body of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed based, such as a reservoir, harbor, lake or storage tank, is shaken, usually by earthquake activity. There are no major water-retaining structures immediately upgradient from the Project area.

An impact related to a seiche could occur if a project would exacerbate the risk of coastal flooding. The proposed Project does not propose any development that would remove a barrier to coastal flooding. The proposed Specific Plan would intensify development near Marine Stadium in the proposed Mixed Use Community Core land use area, however, these areas are at 11 to 20 feet above mean sea level and are upstream from Marina Stadium and Alamitos Bay. Flooding from a seismically-induced seiche is considered unlikely and impacts are less than significant.

Tsunami

A tsunami is a series of ocean waves caused by a sudden displacement of the ocean floor, most often due to earthquakes. Tsunamis caused by underwater seismic activity are a risk for low-lying areas along the Long Beach coastline. Most of the Project area lies within tsunami flood zones designated by the California Geological Survey. Specifically, the areas that would be designated in the Specific Plan as Multifamily Residential uses, Mixed Use Community Core, Mixed Use Marina, and Industrial uses are in such flood zones. The City of Long Beach 2014 Hazards Mitigation Plan identifies impacts associated with tsunami hazards. The most significant impact areas would be the port and properties along the oceanfront. Although the risk of a tsunami is considered low, the impact to property can be high.

Probability of Tsunami-Generating Seismic Events

According to the City's Hazard Mitigation Plan, the California Coast has experienced 14 tsunamis with wave heights higher than three feet since 1812 (Emergency Planning Consultants 2014). The 1964 Alaska/Good Friday earthquake caused tidal surges in both Los Angeles and Orange counties.

In 2007, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach commissioned a study analyzing the potential tsunami hazards affecting the two ports, which are approximately three miles to the west of the Project area. Analysis in the study discusses trans-ocean (e.g., "Pacific-wide") tsunamis generated by remote seismic activity far out at sea and locally-generated tsunamis caused by local seismic activity and/or submarine landslides. The study found that tsunami-generating, 7.5-magnitude earthquake events would be anticipated to affect the region at intervals of approximately 5,000 to 10,000 years. Tsunami-generating landslides are also characterized as occurring "extremely infrequently," likely on the order of every 10,000 years (Moffat & Nichol 2007). For this reason, impacts of potential tsunamis are not expected to be substantial during the lifetime of the proposed Specific Plan. As

noted in the City's Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan, "tsunamis are considered highly unlikely due to geographical and geological features of the coastal region" (Emergency Planning Consultants 2014).

Conclusion

A development project could exacerbate existing tsunami flood hazard if, for instance, it removed a barrier to coastal flooding, or if it lowered the elevation of a site in or next to an existing tsunami flood zone. Buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would not remove seawalls or other barriers to coastal flooding. Considering the low elevation on much of the site and the shallow groundwater table, it is not expected that development projects would propose habitable land uses at lower elevations than the existing.

However, implementation of the proposed Project would allow development of new residential uses in the area along PCH designated Mixed Use Community Core, potentially placing additional residents and structures within the inundation zone of future tsunamis. Therefore, although tsunami-generating events are extremely rare, tsunami-related flooding impacts in the Project area could be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measures were included in the DEIR and the FEIR, and are applicable to the proposed Project. The measures as provided include any revisions incorporated in the FEIR.

HYD-5 Upon submission of development applications for development projects in the tsunami inundation zone (as identified in the City's Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan) the Development Services Department shall provide project applicants with tsunami awareness and preparedness materials.

HYD-6 Prior to certificate of occupancy, project applicants and developers shall demonstrate to the Development Services Department that lease agreements and disclosures provided to homeowners and tenants disclose that those parties would be in a tsunami inundation zone (as identified in the City's Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan). This notification shall include tsunami awareness and preparedness materials as well as information outlining applicable evacuation plans and routes.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

5. Noise

Impact 5.12-2:	Construction activities associated with development projects that would be accommodated by the Southeast Area Specific Plan and industrial operations at future development sites within the Project area may expose sensitive uses to strong levels of groundborne vibration. [Threshold N-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.12, *Noise*, starting on page 5.12-26 of the DEIR.

Construction Vibration Impacts

Vibration generated by construction equipment has the potential to be substantial, since it has the potential to exceed the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) criteria for human annoyance of 78 VdB and structural damage of 0.200 in/sec. However, groundborne vibration is almost never annoying to people who are outdoors, so it is usually evaluated in terms of indoor receivers (FTA 2006). Construction details and equipment for individual development projects that would be accommodated by the proposed Project are not known at this time. Vibration impacts may occur from construction equipment associated with development in accordance with the implementation of the proposed Project. Therefore, construction vibration impacts are considered significant.

Roadway-Related Vibration Impacts

Operation of new commercial land uses could generate additional truck trips that could potentially generate various levels of vibration along the traveled roadways. However, trucks do not typically generate high levels of vibration because they travel on rubber wheels and do not have vertical movement, which generates ground vibration (Caltrans 2002). Therefore, roadway routes within the Project area are not expected to generate excessive vibration, and traffic-induced vibration levels would be less than significant.

Other Operations Vibration Impacts

Industrial operations can possibly generate varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the operational procedures and equipment. The effect on buildings in the vicinity of the vibration source varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and receptor-building construction. Because specific project-level information is not available at this time for individual development projects that would be accommodated by the proposed Project, it is not possible to quantify future vibration levels at vibration-sensitive receptors that may be in close proximity to existing and future vibration sources. Therefore, with the potential for sensitive uses within the Project area to be exposed to annoying and/or interfering levels of vibration from industrial operations, such operations-related vibration impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project are considered significant.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measures were included in the DEIR and the FEIR, and are applicable to the proposed Project. The measures as provided include any revisions incorporated in the FEIR.

N-2 Prior to issuance of a building permit for any development project requiring pile driving or blasting, the project applicant/developer shall prepare a noise and vibration analysis to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to these activities. The maximum levels shall not exceed 0.2 inch/second, which is the level that can cause architectural damage for typical residential construction. If maximum levels would exceed these thresholds, alternative methods such static rollers, nonexplosive blasting, and drilling piles as opposed to pile driving shall be used.

N-3 Prior to issuance of a building permit for projects involving the development of new industrial uses within 200 feet of any existing residential use, the property owner/developer shall retain an acoustical engineer to conduct an acoustic analysis that includes a vibration analysis for potential impacts from vibration generated by industrial activities. The detailed acoustical analysis shall be submitted to the City of Long Beach Development Services Department for review and shall demonstrate that the vibration levels at any nearby residential use would be below 78 VdB during the daytime (7 AM to 10 PM) and 72 VdB during the nighttime (10 PM to 7 AM), which are the Federal Transit Administration's daytime and nighttime criteria to regulate general vibration impacts at affected residential uses.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

E. Findings on Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

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

1. Air Quality

Impact 5.3 1:	Buildout of the Project would generate slightly more growth than the existing General Plan; therefore, the Project would be inconsistent with SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan. [Threshold AQ 1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.3, *Air Quality*, starting on page 5.3-22 of the DEIR.

Per CEQA Guideline Section 15206, SEASP is considered regionally significant by SCAG. Changes in the population, housing, or employment growth projections associated with this Project have the potential to substantially affect SCAG's demographic projections and therefore the assumptions in South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). SEASP would increase the land use intensity within the Project site, resulting in an increase in population and employment in the SEASP area. Because regional transportation modeling is based on the underlying General Plan land use designation, SEASP could potentially change the assumptions of the AQMP.

The AQMP ensures that the region is on track to attain the California and federal ambient air quality standards (AAQS). When a project has the potential to exceed the assumptions of the AQMP because it is more intensive than the underlying land use designation, criteria air pollutants generated during operation of development that would be accommodated by that project are compared to SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds, which were established to determine whether a project has the potential to cumulatively contribute to the South Coast Air Basin's (SoCAB) nonattainment

designations. Development that would be accommodated by the SEASP would exceed SCAQMD's regional operational thresholds. As a result, the proposed Project could potentially exceed the assumptions in the AQMP and would not be considered consistent with the AQMP.

SEASP would be consistent with SCAG's regional goals of providing infill housing, improving the jobs-housing balance, and integrating land uses near major transportation corridors. Building upon the recommendations of the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, SEASP incorporates two mixed use districts—Mixed-Use Community Core and the Mixed-Use Marina—that would encourage a greater mix of uses. Guiding principles of SEASP include: Expand multimodal transportation options through enhanced pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and increase public connectivity to open space, including the marina, other waterways, the wetlands, and parks. Additionally, implementation of SEASP would result in a decrease in VMT per service population (SP) from 45.3 VMT/SP to 36.6 VMT/SP, which is consistent with regional goals to reduce passenger VMT.

However, despite furthering the regional transportation and planning objectives, SEASP would represent a substantial increase in emissions compared to existing conditions and would exceed SCAQMD's regional operational significance thresholds (see Impact 5.3-3). As a result, SEASP could potentially exceed the assumptions in the AQMP and would not be considered consistent with the AQMP. Consequently, impacts would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure:

Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-6 applied for Impact 5.3-2 and Impact 5.3-3 would reduce the proposed Project's regional construction-related and operational-phase criteria air pollutant emissions to the extent feasible to minimize potential conflicts with the SCAQMD AQMP. However, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts associated with inconsistency with the air quality management plans due to the magnitude of growth and associated emissions that would be generated by the buildout of SEASP.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed Project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.3-2:	Construction activities associated with the Project would generate a substantial increase in short-term criteria air pollutant emissions that exceeds the threshold criteria and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. [Thresholds AQ-2, AQ-3, and AQ-4]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.3, *Air Quality*, starting on page 5.3-24 of the DEIR.

Construction activities would temporarily increase PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, volatile organic compounds (VOC), nitrous oxides (NO_X), sulfur oxides (SO_X), and carbon monoxide (CO) regional emissions within the SoCAB. Construction activities associated with buildout of SEASP are anticipated to occur sporadically over approximately 20 years or more. Buildout would comprise multiple smaller projects undertaken by individual developers/project applicants, each having its own construction timeline and activities. Development of multiple properties could occur at the same time; however, there is no defined development schedule for these future projects at this time. For this analysis, the maximum daily emissions are based on a very conservative scenario, where several construction projects throughout the SEASP area would occur at the same time and all construction phases would overlap. The amount of construction assumed is consistent with the approximately 20-year anticipated buildout of the SEASP area.

An estimate of maximum daily construction emissions is provided in Table 5.3-8, *Estimate of Regional Construction Emissions in the Southeast Area Specific Plan*, of the DEIR. As shown in the table, construction activities associated with the proposed Project could potentially exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds for VOC and NO_X. The primary source of NO_X emissions is exhaust from vehicles and construction equipment. NO_X is a precursor to the formation of both O_3 and particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$). VOC is produced by equipment exhaust and off-gas of architectural coatings and paving. VOC is a precursor to the formation of O_3. Project-related emissions of VOC and NO_X would contribute to the O_3, NO_2, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Therefore, Project-related construction activities would result in significant regional air quality impacts. Because cumulative development within SEASP would exceed the regional significance thresholds, construction of the Project could contribute to an increase in health effects in the basin until such time as the attainment standards are met.

Mitigation Measure:

AQ-1 Applicants for new development projects within the Southeast Area Specific Plan shall require the construction contractor to use equipment that meets the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 4 emissions standards for off-road diesel-powered construction equipment with more than 50 horsepower, unless it can be demonstrated to the City of Long Beach that such equipment is not available.

Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 4 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine, as defined by the California Air Resources Board's regulations.

Prior to construction, the project engineer shall ensure that all demolition and grading plans clearly show the requirement for EPA Tier 4 or higher emissions standards for construction equipment over 50 horsepower. During construction, the construction contractor shall maintain a list of all operating equipment in use on the construction site for verification by the City of Long Beach. The construction equipment list shall state the makes, models, and numbers of construction equipment onsite. Equipment shall be properly serviced and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. Construction contractors shall also ensure that all nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less in compliance with California Air Resources Board's Rule 2449.

AQ-2 Applicants for new development projects within the Southeast Area Specific Plan shall require the construction contractor to prepare a dust control plan and implement the following measures during ground-disturbing activities—in addition to the existing requirements for fugitive dust control under South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403—to further reduce PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions. The City of Long Beach shall verify that these measures have been implemented during normal construction site inspections.

- Following all grading activities, the construction contractor shall reestablish ground cover on the construction site through seeding and watering.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall sweep streets with SCAQMD Rule 1186–compliant, PM_{10}-efficient vacuum units on a daily basis if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares or occurs as a result of hauling.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall maintain a minimum 24-inch freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials and shall tarp materials with a fabric cover or other cover that achieves the same amount of protection.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall water exposed ground surfaces and disturbed areas a minimum of every three hours on the construction site and a minimum of three times per day.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall limit onsite vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to no more than 15 miles per hour.
- Heavy construction vehicles trips shall be limited to off-peak hours.

AQ-3 Applicants for new development projects within the Southeast Area Specific Plan shall require the construction contractor to use coatings and solvents with a volatile organic compound (VOC) content lower than required under South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113 (i.e., super compliant paints). The construction contractor shall also use precoated/natural-colored building materials, where feasible. Use of low-VOC paints and spray method shall be included as a note on architectural building plans and verified by the City of Long Beach during construction.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed Project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.3-3:	Long-term operation of the Project would generate a substantial increase in criteria air pollutant emissions that exceed the threshold criteria and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. [Thresholds AQ-2 and AQ-3]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.3, *Air Quality*, starting on page 5.3-26 of the DEIR.

Buildout of SEASP would result in direct and indirect criteria air pollutant emissions from transportation, energy (natural gas use), and area sources (e.g., natural gas fireplaces, aerosols, landscaping equipment). Transportation sources of criteria air pollutant emission are based on the traffic impact analysis conducted by Fehr & Peers (see Appendix J1 of the Recirculated DEIR).

As shown in Table 5.3-9, *Maximum Daily Southeast Area Specific Plan Operational Phase Regional Emissions*, of the DEIR, the operation phase of SEASP at buildout would generate air pollutant emissions that exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds for VOC. Construction of the new residential and nonresidential uses would be based on market-demand and would be constructed over the approximately 20-year Project buildout; therefore, emissions from construction activities could add to the total emissions during early phases (see Table 5.3-8 of the DEIR). Table 5.3-9 shows maximum daily emissions at buildout once construction is complete and during a worst-case year from overlap of the Project with construction. Emissions of VOC that exceed the SCAQMD regional threshold would cumulatively contribute to the ozone (O_3) nonattainment designation of the SoCAB. Therefore, implementation of SEASP would result in a significant impact because it would significantly contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Because cumulative development within SEASP would exceed the regional significance thresholds, operation of the Project could contribute to an increase in health effects in the basin.

Mitigation Measure:

Stationary Source

AQ-4 Prior to issuance of a building permit for new development projects within the Southeast Area Specific Plan, the property owner/developer shall show on the building plans that all major appliances (dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers) to be provided/installed are Energy Star appliances. Installation of Energy Star appliances shall be verified by the City of Long Beach prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Transportation and Motor Vehicles

AQ-5 Prior to issuance of building permits for residential development projects within the Southeast Area Specific Plan, the property owner/developer shall indicate on the building plans that the following features have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Long Beach prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

- For multifamily dwellings, electric vehicle charging shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code and the Long Beach Municipal Code.
- Bicycle parking shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.9 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.

AQ-6 Prior to issuance of building permits for nonresidential development projects within the Southeast Area Specific Plan, the property owner/developer shall indicate on the building plans that the following features have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Long Beach prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

- For buildings with more than ten tenant-occupants, changing/shower facilities shall be provided as specified in Section A5.106.4.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.
- Preferential parking for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles shall be provided as specified in Section A5.106.5.1 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.
- Facilities shall be installed to support future electric vehicle charging at each nonresidential building with 30 or more parking spaces. Installation shall be consistent with Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code and the Long Beach Municipal Code.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are

identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed Project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.3-4:	Construction activities related to buildout of the proposed Project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. [Threshold AQ-4]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.3, *Air Quality*, starting on page 5.3-28 of the DEIR.

Buildout of SEASP would occur over a period of approximately 20 years or longer and would comprise several smaller projects with their own construction time frame and construction equipment. Concentrations of criteria air pollutants generated by a development project depend on the emissions generated onsite and the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor. Therefore, an LST analysis can only be conducted at a project level, and quantification of LSTs is not applicable for this program-level environmental analysis. Because potential redevelopment could occur close to existing sensitive receptors, the development that would be accommodated by SEASP has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Construction equipment exhaust combined with fugitive particulate matter emissions has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of criteria air pollutant emissions and result in a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure:

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

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of

these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed Project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.3-5:	Buildout of the Project could result in new sources of criteria air pollutant emissions and/or toxic air contaminants near existing or planned sensitive receptors. [Threshold AQ-4]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.3, *Air Quality*, starting on page 5.3-28 of the DEIR.

Operation of new land uses consistent with the land use plan of the Project would generate new sources of criteria air pollutants and TACs. The following describes potential localized operational air quality impacts from the implementation of SEASP.

Onsite Stationary and Area Sources Emissions

Residential, Hotels, Commercial, Retail, Office

Operation of residential and nonresidential structures in SEASP would include occasional use of landscaping equipment, natural gas consumption for heating, and nominal truck idling for vendor deliveries. The proposed Project would permit residential, commercial, and office land uses and would not involve warehousing or similar uses where substantial truck idling could occur onsite. Onsite emissions from the residential and nonresidential uses from onsite energy use (natural gas used for cooking and water heating) and other onsite sources (e.g., landscaping fuel, aerosols) would not generate substantial concentrations of emissions or exacerbate existing health risk in the area.

Industrial and Other Land Uses Requiring a SCAQMD Permit

Certain types of land uses have the potential to generate substantial stationary and area sources of emissions. Land uses that have the potential to generate substantial stationary sources of emissions that would require a permit from SCAQMD include industrial land uses, such as chemical processing facilities, dry cleaners, and gasoline-dispensing facilities. In addition to stationary/area sources of TACs, warehousing and trucking facilities could generate a substantial amount of diesel particulate matter emissions from off-road equipment use and truck idling. The exact nature of new industrial uses is speculative for this broad-based Specific Plan. Additionally, future oil and gas operations are subject to the City's Municipal Code, Title 12, Oil Production Regulations, and CEQA review. Because SEASP could permit industrial land uses, there is a potential for new industrial uses to generate stationary sources of emissions that could impact nearby sensitive receptors.

Stationary sources of emissions would be controlled by SCAQMD through permitting and would be subject to further study and health risk assessment prior to the issuance of any necessary air quality permits under SCAQMD's New Source Review. Because the nature of those emissions cannot be determined at this time and they are subject to further regulation and permitting, they will not be addressed further in this analysis but are considered a potentially significant impact of the Project.

Mobile Source Emissions: CO Hotspots

Buildout of the SEASP would not produce the volume of traffic required to generate a CO hotspot, thus impacts from CO hotspots are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

AQ-7 New industrial land uses that have industrial equipment which requires a permit to operate from the South Coast Air Quality Management District, or have the potential to generate 40 or more diesel trucks per day, and are located within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g. residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Long Beach prior to future discretionary project approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the applicable air quality management district. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (I0E-06), that particulate matter concentrations would exceed 2.5 $\mu g/m^3$, or that the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs) are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. T-BACTs may include, but are not limited to, restricting idling onsite, electrifying warehousing docks to reduce diesel particulate matter, and 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 development plan as a component of the project.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed Project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

2. Cultural Resources

Impact 5.5-1:	Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan could result in an impact on a known and/or unknown historical resource. [Threshold C-1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.5, *Cultural Resources*, starting on page 5.5-18 of the DEIR.

There is one known local historical resource in the Project area, the Bixby Ranch Field Office, and one California-listed Point of Historic Interest and Historical Landmark adjacent to the Project area, Long Beach Marine Stadium. In addition to the resources that have been officially designated, other structures and landmarks have the potential to meet National or State Register criteria. A resource may be considered historical even if it is not officially registered on the National and State Register or local list.

Under CEQA, a project has a significant impact on a historical resource if it "would result in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of historical resources would be materially impaired" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(1)). Material impairment would occur if the project would result in demolition or material alteration of those physical characteristics that convey the resource's historical significance (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(2)).

New development and redevelopment has the potential to occur throughout the Project area. The proposed land use changes and intensification are identified predominantly in the proposed Mixed Use Community Core and Mixed Use Marina areas. These areas are developed, and there are no known historical resources in these areas. The majority of development in this area occurred in the late 1970s and early 1980s and has continued to present day. Therefore, buildings in these land use designations do not meet the age criteria for listing, with two exceptions, the SeaPort Marina (1962) and Best Western Golden Sails (1963) hotels. As previously stated, the SeaPort Marina hotel has been evaluated and is not eligible for listing as a historical resource (GPA 2014). The Best Western Golden Sails hotel is over 50 years old and has not been formally evaluated. If a formal evaluation determines that the Golden Sails hotel would be eligible for listing on the CRHR, then demolition and redevelopment of the hotel would result in a significant impact to historical resources. In addition, buildings within the Mixed Use Community Core that do not currently meet the age criteria for listing could become 45 years or older during the life of the plan, since buildout would occur over a minimum 20-year period. If future development would impact buildings 45 years or older, a formal historical resources evaluation would be required at that time.

Similar to redevelopment within the proposed mixed use areas, the proposed Project would allow for redevelopment of residential and industrial uses consistent with the provisions in the Southeast Area Specific Plan. Although intensification is not proposed or anticipated in these areas and no site-specific development or redevelopment is proposed as this time, future development could impact potential historical resources. As stated previously, residential developments began in the 1960s. Substations and power plants in the proposed Industrial land use area meet the age criteria to be considered historic and would require further evaluation at the time site specific development is proposed to determine whether these structures have the potential for listing as a historical resource.

Redevelopment of these areas could impact historical resources and is considered a significant impact.

Marine Stadium, a historical landmark, is adjacent to the southwest boundary of the Specific Plan area. Impacts to a historical resource could occur if there are conflicts or impacts to the resources in the immediately surrounding area. The existing residential properties immediately adjacent to Marine Stadium are currently built out and not expected to result in land use changes. Furthermore, the areas of proposed intensification in the Mixed Use Community Core are not expected to impact Marine Stadium because these areas are separated by existing development, Marina Drive, and parking areas. As a result, impacts to Marine Stadium would be less than significant.

The existing oil fields and wetlands in the Project area are considered a potential resource because they date to the historic period and their existence played a major role in the development of the area and region. This area may also be associated with significant persons. The Southeast Area Specific Plan designates this area Coastal, Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation, which allows for very limited land use changes. This land use designation would provide for coastal restoration, visitor-serving recreation (boating, public launching, kayaking, paddle boarding, etc.), and biological reserves. An interpretative or education center and parking may also be allowed. Wetlands restoration activities in this area would enhance its biological and historic value, ensuring impacts are less than significant.

The Coastal, Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation designation allows for ongoing oil operations and encourages the consolidation of wells. If the oil fields have some historical significance, the wells themselves would not be a contributing factor, because no unique way of drilling or design stands out. Whether the wells exist as they are today or are grouped together does not affect the general history of the area. Therefore, the Specific Plan policy encouraging the consolidation of the wells does not have the potential to impact a historical resource. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

The following mitigation measures were included in the DEIR and the FEIR, and are applicable to the proposed Project. The measures as provided include any revisions incorporated in the FEIR.

CUL-1 Future development or redevelopment projects on or near buildings or structures 45 years of age or older shall require an intensive-level historical evaluation. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant/developer shall prepare the evaluation in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local guidelines for evaluating historical resources. If, based on the evaluation of the property, it is determined that the proposed development or redevelopment project will have a substantial adverse effect on a historical resource (i.e., it would reduce its integrity to the point that it would no longer be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or in the list of Long Beach Landmarks), then the provisions of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 shall be implemented by the property owner or project applicant/developer to eliminate or reduce the project's impact on historical resources.

CUL-2 If, based on the intensive-level historical evaluation required under Mitigation Measure CUL-1, it is determined that the proposed development or redevelopment project will have a substantial adverse effect on a historical resource, the City of Long Beach shall

require the property owner or project applicant/developer to implement the following measures:

A. Rehabilitation According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards

1. If the proposed project includes renovation, alteration, or an addition to a historical resource (not including total demolition), then the property owner or project applicant/developer shall first seek to design all proposed renovation, alterations, or additions to the historical resource in a manner that is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards), found at: http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation/rehab/stand.htm.

    a. Plans for rehabilitation shall be created under the supervision of a professional meeting the Department of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in Architectural History or Historic Architecture and be designed by a licensed architect with demonstrated historic preservation experience.

    b. Plans shall be reviewed in the schematic design phase prior to any construction work, as well as in the 60 and 90 percent construction documents phases, for compliance with the Standards by a historic preservation professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards with demonstrated experience with the Standards compliance reviews.

    c. The qualified historic preservation professional reviewing the plans shall create a technical memo at each phase and submit the memo to the City of Long Beach Development Services Department for concurrence.

    d. At the discretion of the City, a detailed character-defining features analysis and/or historical resource treatment plan may need to be prepared for select historical resources by a historic preservation professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards if the nature of the project or the significance of the property warrants such detailed analysis.

    e. A qualified historic preservation professional shall monitor construction activities at key milestones to ensure that the work to be conducted complies with the Standards. The milestones shall be agreed upon in advance by the City and property owner or project applicant/developer.

f. City staff and the qualified historic preservation professional shall review the finished rehabilitation/renovation in person upon completion.

g. In the event that any historical resource(s) are leased to third-party tenants and tenant improvements will be made, all of the terms of this stipulation shall be disclosed in the lease agreements, agreed upon in writing, and mutually enforced by the property owner or project applicant/developer and the City. The tenants shall not be permitted to conduct work that does not comply with the Standards.

B. Retention/On-Site Relocation- For Proposed Demolition

1. If the proposed project includes total demolition of a historical resource, the property owner or project applicant/developer shall first consider an alternative that retains the historical resource and incorporates it into the overall project development as an adaptive re-use of the building.

2. If the project site permits, the historical resource should be relocated to another location on the site, and the resource should be reincorporated into the overall project.

3. If the City determines that retention/onsite relocation of the historical resource is not feasible through a credible feasibility study, the City shall elect to allow the property owner or project applicant/developer to move forward with the development/redevelopment project; however, all other requirements outlined in this mitigation measure shall apply.

C. Third Party Sale

1. If the City determines that retention or onsite relocation of the historical resource is not feasible, then the property owner or project applicant/developer shall offer any historical resources scheduled for demolition to the public for sale and offsite relocation by a third party:

a. The historic resource(s) shall be advertised by the property owner or project applicant/developer at a minimum in the following locations: project applicant's/developer's website (if applicable); City of Long Beach website; *Los Angeles Times* website and print editions; *Long Beach Press Telegram.*

b. The bidding period shall remain open for 60 days after the date of advertisement to allow adequate response time from interested parties.

c. Qualified parties shall meet the following minimum qualifications to be considered a realistic buyer: possess adequate financial resources to relocate and rehabilitate the historical resource(s); possess an available

location for the historical resource(s); and provide for a new use for the historical resource(s).

d. The City shall approve the qualified buyer. If no such buyer comes forward within the allotted time frame, the City shall elect to issue a demolition permit for the historical resource. However, all other requirements outlined in this mitigation measure shall apply.

D. Recordation

1. The property owner or project applicant/developer shall create HABS-like Level II documentation prepared in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation. Information on the Standards and Guidelines is available at the following links: http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_6.htm.
http://www.nps.gov/history/hdp/standards/index.htm.

a. Photographs with large-format black-and-white negatives (4 inches by 5 inches or larger) of the property as a whole shall be provided; photocopies with large format negatives of select existing drawings, site plans, or historic views where available. A minimum of 12 views showing context and relationship of historical resources to each other shall be provided; aerial views showing the whole property shall also be provided.

b. Written historical descriptive data, index to photographs and photo key plan shall be provided.

c. The above items shall be created by a historic preservation professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards with demonstrated experience in creating HABS Level II documentation.

d. The above items shall be created prior to any demolition or relocation work.

e. The above items shall be distributed to the following repositories for use by future researchers and educators. Before submitting any documents, each of the following repositories shall be contacted to ensure that they are willing and able to accept the items: City of Long Beach Public Library; Long Beach Historical Society; Los Angeles Public Library; South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton; and City of Long Beach Development Services Department (building files).

E. Salvage and Reuse

1. If offsite relocation of the historical resource by a third party is not accomplished, the property owner or project applicant/developer shall create a salvage and reuse plan identifying elements and materials of the resource that can be saved prior to any demolition work.

    a. The salvage and reuse plan shall be included in bid documents prepared for the site and shall be created by a historic preservation professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards with demonstrated experience in creating salvage and reuse plans.

    b. Elements and materials that may be salvageable include windows; doors; roof tiles; decorative elements; bricks, foundation materials, and/or paving materials; framing members; furniture; lighting; and flooring materials, such as tiles and hardwood.

2. The property owner or project applicant/developer shall identify individuals, organizations, or businesses interested in receiving the salvaged items; these may include Habitat for Humanity Restore; other affordable housing organizations; or salvage yards. The following steps shall be taken by the property owner or project applicant/developer:

    a. Identification of the individuals, organizations, or businesses interested in receiving the salvaged items shall be completed in consultation with the City.

    b. Identification of the individuals, organizations, or businesses interested in receiving the salvaged items shall be accomplished by contacting potentially interested parties directly first.

    c. Items to be salvaged shall be advertised in the following locations for a period of 60 days if none of the contacted parties are able to receive the items: *Los Angeles Times* and *Long Beach Press Telegram*.

3. The property owner or project applicant/developer shall remove salvageable items in the gentlest, least destructive manner possible. Historic materials and features shall be protected by storing salvaged items in indoor, climate- and weather-controlled conditions until recipients can retrieve them. The removal of salvageable items shall be performed by a licensed contractor with demonstrated experience with implementing salvage and reuse plans.

F. Other Optional Interpretive, Commemorative, or Educational Measures

The City may also elect to require additional (optional) mitigation measures crafted in response to a specific historical resource's property type or significance, association with a specific historic person, or overall value to the

community, as practical, so long as the measure is commensurate with the significance of the property and the level of impact to that resource. Such measures may include educational or interpretive programming; signage; incorporation of historical features into new developments or public art; contribution to a mitigation fund for future historic preservation efforts; written histories or contexts important to the public's understanding of the lost resource (presuming no other extant resource can interpret such significance); etc. The need for these additional measures shall be determined by the City on a case-by-case basis and incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project. Some measures may be made available to the public through museum displays, written reports at research repositories, on- or offsite signage, or existing online multimedia sites.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed Project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

3. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact 5.7-1	Buildout of the Southeast Area Specific Plan would generate a substantial increase in GHG emissions compared to existing conditions and would have a significant impact on the environment. [GHG-1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.7, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, starting on page 5.7-27 of the DEIR.

The community GHG emissions inventory for SEASP at buildout compared to existing conditions is in Table 5.7-6, *Southeast Area Specific Plan GHG Emissions Inventory*, in the DEIR. As shown in Table 5.7-6, the net increase in GHG emissions of 30,357 million tons of carbon dioxide equivalent ($MTCO_2e$) annually from Project-related operational activities would exceed SCAQMD's draft bright-line screening threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ for all land use types. The increase in overall land use intensity and associated population and employment growth within the SEASP boundaries is the primary factor for the increase in overall GHG emissions. Under SEASP, increase in land use development would result in a 92 percent increase in the total service population. Although SEASP

would result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions, it would also result in a 38 percent decrease in GHG emissions per person. The GHG emissions per capita rate would decrease from 12.5 $MTCO_2e$/year/service population (SP) to 7.7 $MTCO_2e$/year/SP.

The improvement in per capita efficiency would be attributable to the overall land use plan and development standards of SEASP. SEASP would result in conversion of the land uses from septic to tertiary-treated waste. Placement of land uses that complement each other in addition to improvements in access to alternative transportation options contribute to reducing per capita VMT. Aside from the policies and strategies to reduce per capita VMT, new buildings under SEASP would be more energy efficient than existing buildings throughout the SEASP area. Likewise, plumbing fixtures and landscaping installed as part of SEASP would result in a decrease in water use on a per capita basis. These aspects of SEASP would contribute to the overall reduction of per capita GHG emissions.

However, although implementation of SEASP would result in a decrease in GHG emissions per capita, it would not meet the SCAQMD Year 2035 target efficiency metric of 2.2 $MTCO_2e$/year/SP based on the long-term GHG reduction goals of Executive Order S-03-05 and Executive Order B-30-15. Additional state and local actions are necessary to achieve the post-2020 GHG reduction goals for the state. CARB has released the 2014 Scoping Plan Update to identify a path for the date to achieve additional GHG reductions. The new Executive Order B-30-15 requires CARB to prepare another update to the Scoping Plan to address the 2030 target for the state. However, at this time, no additional GHG reductions programs have been outlined that get the state to the post-2020 targets identified in Executive Order S-03-05, which are an 80 percent reduction in 1990 emissions by 2050, or the Executive Order B-30-15, which are a 40 percent reduction in 1990 emissions by 2035. As identified by the California Council on Science and Technology, the state cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advances in technology (CCST 2012). Therefore, SEASP's cumulative contribution to the long-term GHG emissions in the state would be considered potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure:

Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-4 through AQ-6.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits,

including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed Project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

4. Noise

Impact 5.12-1:	Construction activities associated with buildout of land uses accommodated by the Project would result in temporary noise increases in the vicinity of noise-sensitive land uses. [Threshold N-3]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.12, *Noise*, starting on page 5.12-24 of the DEIR.

Two types of temporary noise impacts could occur during construction activities associated with development that would be accommodated by SEASP. First, the transport of workers and movement of materials to and from the site could incrementally increase noise levels along local access roads. The second type of temporary noise impact is related to demolition, site preparation, grading, and/or physical construction. Construction is performed in distinct steps, each of which has its own mix of equipment and noise characteristics.

Construction equipment generates high levels of noise, with maximums ranging from 71 dBA to 101 dBA. Construction of individual development projects associated with SEASP would temporarily increase the ambient noise environment and would have the potential to affect noise-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of that project. Per Section 8.80.202 (Construction Activity-Noise Regulations) of the City's municipal code, construction activities are prohibited from 7:00 PM to 7:00 AM Mondays through Fridays and before 9:00 AM and after 6:00 PM on Saturdays. Construction is prohibited on Sundays unless a permit has been issued.

Significant noise impacts may occur from operation of heavy earthmoving equipment and truck hauling that would occur with construction of individual development projects. Implementation of SEASP would result in an increase in development intensity throughout the plan area. Construction noise levels depend on the specific locations, site plans, and construction details of individual development projects, which are not known at this time. Construction-related noise would be localized and would occur intermittently for varying periods of time.

Because specific project-level information is not available at this time, it is impossible to quantify the construction noise impacts at specific sensitive receptors. Construction of individual development projects associated with SEASP would temporarily increase the ambient noise environment in the vicinity of each development project, potentially affecting existing and future sensitive uses in the vicinity. Because these construction activities may occur near noise-sensitive receptors and noise disturbances may occur for prolonged periods of time (depending on the project type), construction noise impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project are considered significant.

Mitigation Measure:

N-1 Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, and/or building permits for development projects accommodated by the Southeast Area Specific Plan, a note shall be provided on development plans indicating that ongoing during grading, demolition, and construction,

the property owner/developer shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-related noise:

- Construction activity is limited to the daytime hours between 7 AM to 7 PM on Monday through Friday and 9 AM to 6 PM on Saturday, as prescribed in the City's municipal code. Construction is prohibited on Sundays.
- All internal combustion engines on construction equipment and trucks are fitted with properly maintained mufflers.
- Stationary equipment such as generators and air compressors shall be located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive uses.
- Stockpiling is located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors.
- Construction traffic shall be limited to the haul routes established by the City of Long Beach.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, and, further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed Project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

5. Transportation and Traffic

Impact 5.16-1:	Project-related trip generation would significantly impact levels of service for the existing area roadway system. [Threshold T-1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*, starting on page 5.16-30 of the Recirculated DEIR.

The potential traffic impacts resulting from the proposed Project within study area are addressed below. As part of the traffic impact assessment (TIA), and consistent with Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) Guidelines, the following scenarios were analyzed in addition to existing conditions:

- **Existing With Project Conditions:** Existing traffic volumes plus Project traffic.

- **Cumulative Year (2035) Without Project Conditions:** Annual growth rate factor applied through Year 2035.
- **Cumulative Year (2035) With Project Conditions:** Cumulative Year traffic volumes plus Project traffic.

In addition to proposed vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements, the Specific Plan includes a number of project design features outlined in Section 5.16.7 of the Recirculated DEIR to reduce vehicle trips. PDF-1 requires the City to establish a Transportation Management Association (TMA) with the authority to implement strategies pertaining to trip reduction through transportation demand management (TDM; PDF-2).

In January 2017, a TDM Plan was drafted to reduce reliance on automobiles, congestion and associated emissions. The TDM Plan addresses the effectiveness of TDM goals and measures; establishes the strategy to meet the TDM goals, the monitoring framework, and implementation of the TMA. The goal of the TDM Plan is to reduce Project-generated AM and PM peak hour trips by 10 percent.

Project Trip Generation

Table 5.16-5 of the Recirculated EIR summarizes the existing and proposed trip generation. The net change would result in an increase of 30,568 daily trip ends, of which 1,748 would occur in the AM peak hour and 2,459 in the PM peak hour.

Existing with Project Conditions

Intersection LOS results for Existing (2015) with Project conditions are summarized in Table 5.16-6 of the Recirculated DEIR. As shown in the table, thirteen of the study intersections would operate at unacceptable levels of service. In addition to the nine intersections identified as deficient under existing conditions shown on Table 5.16-7 of the Recirculated DEIR, the following would be deficient under existing plus Project conditions:

- 6. Bellflower Boulevard & 7th Street: AM and PM Peak Hour
- 12. Pacific Coast Highway & Loynes Drive: PM Peak Hour
- 17. Shopkeeper Road & 2nd Street: PM Peak Hour
- 19. Seal Beach & 2nd Street/Westminster Boulevard: PM Peak Hour

Based on the increase in volume-to-capacity (V/C) due to the Project, eleven study intersections are forecast to result in a significant impact for Existing With Project Conditions, which are listed below:

- 3. Westbound Ramps: SR-22 & Studebaker Road: AM Peak Hour (LOS D), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 4. Ximeno Avenue & 7th Street: AM Peak Hour (LOS E), PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 5. Pacific Coast Highway & 7th Street: AM Peak Hour (LOS D), PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 6. Bellflower Boulevard & 7th Street: AM Peak Hour (LOS D), PM Peak Hour (LOS D)
- 7. Channel Drive & 7th Street: PM Peak Hour (LOS E)

- 12. Pacific Coast Highway & Loynes Drive: PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 16. Pacific Coast Highway & 2nd Street : AM Peak Hour (LOS E), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 17. Shopkeeper Road & 2nd Street: PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 19. 2nd Street/Westminster and Seal Beach Boulevard: PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 26. 7th Street & Park Avenue- AM Peak Hour (LOS E), PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 27. 2nd Street & Bay Shore Ave Avenue- PM Peak Hour (LOS F)

Cumulative Year (2035) Without Project Conditions

Fourteen intersections are expected to operate at a deficient LOS during one or more peak hours for Cumulative Year (2035) Without Project Conditions:

- 3. Studebaker Road & SR-22 Westbound Ramps: AM Peak Hour (LOS D), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 4. Ximeno Avenue & 7th Street: AM Peak Hour (LOS E), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 5. Pacific Coast Highway & 7th Street: AM Peak Hour (LOS F), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 6. Bellflower Boulevard & 7th Street: AM Peak Hour (LOS D), PM Peak Hour (LOS D)
- 7. Channel Drive & 7th Street: PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 8. Campus Drive & 7th Street: AM Peak Hour (LOS D)
- 12. Pacific Coast Highway & Loynes Drive: PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 16. Pacific Coast Highway & 2nd Street: AM Peak Hour (LOS E), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 19. Seal Beach Boulevard & 2nd Street/Westminster Boulevard: PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 20. Pacific Coast Highway & Studebaker Road: PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 22. Pacific Coast Highway & Seal Beach Boulevard: AM Peak Hour (LOS F), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 24. SR-22 at Studebaker Road & College Park Drive: PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 26. 7th Street & Park Avenue: AM Peak Hour (LOS F), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 27. 2nd Street & Bay Shore Avenue: AM Peak Hour (LOS F), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)

Cumulative Year (2035) With Project Conditions

Nineteen intersections are forecast to operate at a deficient LOS during one or more peak hours for Cumulative Year (2035) With Project Conditions. In addition to the intersections identified to operate at deficient LOS under Cumulative Without Project conditions, the following intersections would be deficient under Cumulative Year With Project conditions:

- 11. Studebaker Road & SR-22 Eastbound Ramps
- 13. Studebaker Road & Loynes Drive
- 15. Marina Drive & 2nd Street
- 17. Shopkeeper Road & 2nd Street
- 18. Studebaker Road & 2nd Street

Based on the increase in V/C due to the Project, 18 study intersections are forecast to result in a significant impact for 2035 With Project Conditions:

- 3. Studebaker Road & SR-22 Westbound Ramps (Caltrans): AM Peak Hour (LOS D), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 4. Ximeno Avenue & 7th Street: PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 5. Pacific Coast Highway & 7th Street (Caltrans): AM Peak Hour (LOS F), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 6. Bellflower Boulevard & 7th Street (Caltrans): AM Peak Hour (LOS E), PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 7. Channel Drive & 7th Street (Caltrans): PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 8. Campus Drive & 7th Street (Caltrans): AM and PM Peak Hour (LOS D)
- 11. Studebaker Rd & SR-22 Eastbound Ramps (Caltrans): PM Peak Hour (LOS D)
- 12. Pacific Coast Highway & Loynes Drive (Caltrans): PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 13. Studebaker Road & Loynes Drive: PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 15. Marina Drive & 2nd Street: PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 16. Pacific Coast Highway & 2nd Street (Caltrans): AM Peak Hour (LOS F), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 17. Shopkeeper Road & 2nd Street: PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 18. Studebaker Road & 2nd Street: PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 19. Seal Beach Boulevard & 2nd St/Westminster Boulevard (City of Seal Beach): PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 20. Pacific Coast Highway & Studebaker Road (Caltrans): PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 22. Pacific Coast Highway & Seal Beach Boulevard (Caltrans): AM Peak Hour (LOS F), PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- 26. 7th Street & Park Avenue: AM Peak Hour (LOS F), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- 27. 2nd Street & Bay Shore Avenue: -AM Peak Hour (LOS F), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)

Construction Traffic

Construction activities associated with individual development projects within the Project area would include site demolition/preparation, grading, excavation, fine grading, building construction, and infrastructure improvements. Construction related trips associated with these activities would include trucks associated with import or export of soils, vendor and worker trips. It is expected that large construction equipment, such as excavators, dump trucks, cranes, and tractors, would be used during construction activities. Construction trips would access the Project area via regional facilities—the SR-22, I-605, I-405, PCH, and 7th Street—and local streets, such as Studebaker Road, 2nd Street and PCH.

The proposed Project includes the adoption of the Specific Plan with buildout assumed to occur over an approximate 20 year period. No site specific development is being proposed at this time and construction phasing is dependent on a variety of factors, including market demand. Additionally, the

size of any particular development or developments and anticipated construction schedule is unknown. Therefore, construction trip generation associated with future development under the proposed Specific Plan is unknown at this time. However, the construction trip generation is anticipated to be well within the net increase in trip generation associated with buildout of the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts to the surrounding circulation system and intersections have been addressed in the analysis above under the Existing With Project and Cumulative 2035 With Project scenarios. Temporary construction impacts at Project area intersections would be significant.

Mitigation Measure:

TRAF-1 Prior to the issuance of the first building permit pursuant to the proposed Project, the City of Long Beach shall update the City's traffic mitigation fee program to include the improvements outlined in Mitigation Measure TRAF-3. The City shall prepare a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support changes under consideration for the SEASP. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the traffic improvements and facilities required to mitigate the traffic impacts of new development pursuant to the proposed Project. Traffic improvements and facilities necessary to mitigate the Project impacts shall be included, among other improvements, in the AB 1600 nexus study. The City's fee program shall be updated based on the nexus study. Fees are assessed when there is new construction, an increase in square footage in an existing building, or the conversion of existing square footage to a more intensive use. The development fees collected are applied toward circulation improvements and right-of-way acquisition. Fees are calculated by multiplying the proposed square footage, dwelling unit, or hotel room by the appropriate rate. Traffic mitigation fees are included with any other applicable fees payable at the time the building permit is issued. The City will use the traffic mitigation fees to fund construction (or to recoup fees advanced to fund construction) of the transportation improvements identified in Mitigation Measure TRAF-3.

TRAF-2 As part of the subsequent environmental review for development projects that would be accommodated by the SEASP, a site-specific traffic study shall be prepared by the project applicant/developer to evaluate the project's potential traffic and transportation impacts consistent with the City of Long Beach Guidelines for Signalized Intersections and the Los Angeles County CMP Guidelines to identify specific improvements, as deemed necessary, to provide safe and efficient onsite circulation and access, and limit cut through traffic on adjacent neighborhoods. The traffic study for the first development project to be considered under the SEASP shall include an analysis of signal timing of 2nd Street through Naples to identify timing adjustments needed to improve signal synchronization. The traffic study shall be approved by the Public Works Department. Payment of fees, construction of improvements, and signal timing shall be implemented prior to issuance of a building permit.

TRAF-3 Prior to issuance of building permits for development projects that would be accommodated by the SEASP, project applicants/developers shall make fair-share payments to the City of Long Beach toward construction of the traffic improvements

listed below. The following traffic improvements and facilities are necessary to mitigate impacts of the SEASP and shall be included in the City's fee mechanism(s):

Existing With Project Improvements

- **3. Studebaker Road & SR-22 Westbound Ramps:** Construct a spiral striped roundabout with two circulating lanes, with a southbound slip (bypass) lane. The southbound approach would be striped with two through lanes and one shared through-left turn lane; the westbound approach would have two left turn lanes and one right turn slip lane; and the northbound approach would have two through lanes and one right turn slip lane. This measure would be funded through the City of Long Beach Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and fair-share contributions from area developments.

  Alternatively, the intersection could remain signalized with the following improvements:
  - Modify the westbound approach from two left turn lanes and one right turn lane, to three left turn lanes and one right turn lane.
  - Modify the southbound approach from one left turn lane and one through lane, to one left turn lane and three through lanes.
  - Optimize the AM and PM signal cycle lengths and splits.

- **17. Shopkeeper Road & 2nd Street:** This intersection would require the following improvements:
  - Modify the northbound approach from one shared through-left turn lane and one right turn lane, to one shared through-left turn lane and two right turn lanes.
  - Modify the westbound approach from one left turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane, to two left turn lanes, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane.

- **27. 2nd Street & Bay Shore Ave Avenue:** This intersection would require the following improvements:
  - Reconfigure the northbound approach to provide a dedicated left-turn lane, and a shared through/right-turn lane.
  - Add a southbound right-turn lane.
  - Add an eastbound right-turn lane and restripe the shared through/right-turn lane as a through lane.

Cumulative Year (2035) With Project Improvements

- **3. and 11. Studebaker Road & SR-22 West- and Eastbound Ramps:** Construct a spiral striped roundabout with two circulating lanes, with a southbound slip (bypass) lane. The southbound approach would be striped with

two through lanes and one shared through-left turn lane; the westbound approach would have two left turn lanes and one right turn slip lane; and the northbound approach would have two through lanes and one right turn slip lane. This measure would be funded through the City of Long Beach Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

Alternatively, the intersection could remain signalized and with the following improvements:

- Modify the westbound approach from two left turn lanes and one right turn lane, to three left turn lanes and one right turn lane.
- Modify the northbound approach from one through lane and one shared through-right turn lane, to two through lanes and one shared through-right turn lane.
- Modify the southbound approach from one left turn lane and one through lane, to one left turn lane and three through lanes.
- Optimize the AM and PM signal cycle lengths and splits.

- **15. Marina Drive & 2nd Street:** This intersection would require the following improvements:
  - Modify the northbound approach from one left turn lane, one shared through-left turn lane, one through lane, and one right turn lane, to two left turn lanes, one through lane, and one right turn lane.
  - Modify the southbound approach from one left turn lane, one shared through-left turn lane, and one right turn lane, to two left turn lanes, one through lane, and one right turn lane.
  - Modify the westbound approach from one left turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane, to two left turn lanes, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane.
- **17. Shopkeeper Road & 2nd Street:** This intersection would require the following improvements:
  - Modify the westbound approach from one left turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane, to two left turn lanes, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane.
  - Modify the eastbound approach from one left turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane, to one left turn lane, three through lanes, and one right turn lane.
- **20. PCH & Studebaker Road:** This intersection would require the following improvements:

- Modify the southbound approach from one left turn lane, two through lanes, one right turn lane, and one right turn lane, to one left turn lane, three through lanes, one right turn lane.
- Optimization of the PM signal cycle lengths and splits.

TRAF-4 Prior to issuance of building permits for development projects that would be accommodated by the SEASP, project applicants/developers shall make fair-share payments to the City of Seal Beach toward construction of the traffic improvement listed below. Fair-share payments shall occur through either: 1) an agreement between the developer and City of Seal Beach to pay fair share funding for the improvement or 2) payment to the City of Seal Beach traffic mitigation fee program that is 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). The traffic mitigation fee program must include the intersection improvements identified below. If the City's traffic fee program has not incorporated the intersections identified below at the time of building permits and the applicant has made reasonable efforts to contribute its fair share, then project applicants shall have no further obligation to comply with this mitigation measure.

- **19. Seal Beach Boulevard & 2nd Street/Westminster Boulevard:** Modify the northbound approach from having one left turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane, to having one left turn lane, three through lanes, and one right turn lane.
- **22. PCH & Seal Beach Boulevard:** This intersection would require the following improvements:
  - Provide three through lanes on the northbound approach.

TRAF-5 Prior to issuance of grading permits for development projects that would be accommodated by the SEASP, project applicants/developers shall prepare a construction management plan. The construction management plan shall be approved by the City of Long Beach Public Works Department. The construction management plan shall identify construction hours, truck routes, travel patterns for haul routes, staging and parking areas, staggered worker arrival times, and safety procedures for pedestrians and cyclists. The construction management plan shall prohibit the use of heavy construction vehicles during peak hours. The plan shall also require the construction contractor to implement the following measures during construction activities, which shall be discussed at the pre-grading conference/meeting:

- Minimize obstruction of through-traffic lanes and provide temporary traffic controls, such as a flag person, during all roadway improvement activities to maintain adequate access for emergency vehicles and personnel.
- Develop a traffic plan to minimize interference for emergency vehicles and personnel from demolition and construction activities (e.g., advanced public notice of demolition and construction activities)

Mitigation Measures Considered and Rejected

Mitigation measures were evaluated for every impacted intersection in detail (see Section 12 of the TIA in Appendix J1 of the Recirculated DEIR). However, some mitigation measures were determined to be infeasible for the reasons in Section 5.16-8 of the Recirculated DEIR.

The traditional method of mitigating significant traffic-related impacts—when defined as delays to autos due to overcapacity or increases in auto trips on street segments—is to increase auto capacity by providing additional lanes or facilities. Widening roads is challenging because space in the Project area is already constrained and utilized by other land uses, wetlands, or transportation facilities. Due to the limited right-of-way in the Project area and surrounding areas of Long Beach, capacity improvements for autos may require the loss or constriction of bicycle lanes, sidewalks, parking lots, etc. The traffic analysis for this Project could not identify any additional capacity improvements for autos that would not impact existing buildings or have negative secondary impacts—such as eliminating wetland areas or parking or degrading the pedestrian environment. However, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would improve mobility in the area through pedestrian and bicycle improvements and other TDM measures.

Impacts for which mitigation measures were evaluated but improvements were deemed infeasible due to right-of-way constraints, encroaching on wetlands, degradation of pedestrian facilities or are under the jurisdiction of another agency are provided in Table 5.16-20 of the Recirculated DEIR. This table provides a summary of the mitigation measures needed and the reason that the mitigation measures are deemed infeasible.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, that such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency (i.e., Caltrans, California Coastal Commission, or City of Seal Beach) and not the agency making the finding, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (2), (3)).

As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed Project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.16-2:	Project-related trip generation would impact levels of service for the freeway system. [Threshold T-1]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*, starting on page 5.16-46 of the Recirculated DEIR.

Traffic impacts to the freeway system were evaluated using the criteria in the Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (2002) for freeway mainline and ramp facilities.

Existing With Project Conditions

As shown in Table 5.16-11 of the Recirculated DEIR, the following freeway segments, off-ramps, and on-ramps would operate at a deficient LOS during the peak hours for Existing (2015) With Project Conditions:

- Westbound SR-22: AM Peak Hour (LOS F), PM Peak Hour (LOS E)
- Studebaker Off-Ramp: PM Peak Hour (LOS D)
- Studebaker On-Ramp: AM Peak Hour (LOS D), PM Peak Hour (LOS D)
- Eastbound SR-22: AM Peak Hour (LOS E), PM Peak Hour (LOS D)
- Northbound I-405 from Studebaker Road to Cherry Avenue: AM and PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- Southbound I-405 from Cherry Avenue to Studebaker Road: AM and PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- I-405 Southbound North of Studebaker Road: AM Peak Hour (LOS E), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- Northbound I-605 from I-405 to Katella Avenue: AM Peak Hour (LOS E), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- Northbound I-605 from Katella Avenue to Carson Avenue: AM and PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- Southbound I-605 from Carson Avenue to I-405: AM and PM Peak Hour (LOS F)

Compared to existing conditions, the Studebaker Off-Ramp, and the mainline segment of Southbound I-605 from Katella Avenue to I-405 become deficient under existing plus Project conditions. Given that the Project adds traffic to congested local freeway facilities, this is considered a significant impact.

Cumulative (2035) Freeway Operations

As shown in Table 5.16-12 of the Recirculated DEIR, the following freeway segments, off-ramps, and on-ramps would operate at a deficient LOS during the peak hours for Cumulative (2035) Without Project Conditions:

- Westbound SR-22: AM Peak Hour (LOS D), PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- Studebaker Off-Ramp: PM Peak Hour (LOS D)
- Studebaker On-Ramp: AM Peak Hour (LOS D), PM Peak Hour (LOS D)
- Eastbound SR-22: AM Peak Hour (LOS E), PM Peak Hour (LOS D)
- Northbound I-405 from Studebaker Road to Cherry Avenue: AM and PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- Southbound I-405 from Cherry Avenue to Studebaker Road: AM and PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- Northbound I-605 from Katella Ave to I-405 to Carson Avenue: AM and PM Peak Hour (LOS F)
- Southbound I-605 from Carson Avenue to I-405: AM and PM Peak Hour (LOS F)

As shown in Table 5.16-13 of the Recirculated DEIR, the same freeway segments, off-ramps, and on-ramps listed above under Cumulative Without Project conditions would operate at a deficient LOS during the peak hours for Cumulative (2035) With Project Conditions. Additionally, the Studebaker Off-Ramp would worsen from a PM Peak Hour of LOS D to LOS F.

In general, the freeway assessment reflects the peak hour congestion that much of Southern California experiences during peak periods. Given that the Project would add traffic to area freeways, the Project impact to freeway segments operating at poor levels of service is considered significant.

Freeway Ramp Queuing Analysis

A queueing assessment was completed for the freeway ramps in the study area to ensure that traffic does not back up onto mainline freeway lanes. Ramps evaluated as part of the queuing assessment include:

- Studebaker Road & I-405 Southbound Off-Ramp
- Studebaker Road & SR-22 Eastbound Off-Ramp

Under Existing Without and With Project scenarios, storage is not exceeded on the off-ramps in the study area, therefore impacts are considered less than significant. Queueing is increased under the With Project scenario. However, queuing on the ramps does not exceed storage during the AM or PM peak hours. As a result, impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

TRAF-6 Prior to issuance of the first the occupancy permits for development projects that would be accommodated by the SEASP, the City and Caltrans shall jointly identify feasible operational and physical improvements and the associated fair-share funding contribution necessary to mitigate Project-related impacts to state transportation facilities. 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 and public development to supplement other regional and State funding sources necessary undertake improvements to the I-22, I-605, and I-405, in the Project study area, 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 and or public 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 I-22, I-605, and I-405 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. The study shall set forth a timeline and other relevant criteria for implementation of the recommendations contained within the study to the extent the other agencies agree to participate in the fee study program.

In the event the study has been prepared, project applicants shall use reasonable efforts to pay the fair share amount to Caltrans. 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. Caltrans shall only accept the fair share payment if the fair share fee study has been completed. If, within five years from the date that the first building permit is issued for the Project, Caltrans has not completed the fair share fee study, then project applicants shall have no further obligation to comply with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measures Considered and Rejected

The proposed Project would result in Project-level and cumulative impacts to the following freeway facilities: northbound and southbound I-405, northbound and southbound I-605, westbound and eastbound SR-22, and the SR-22 Studebaker off-ramp and on-ramp (merge and diverge analysis).

Impacts to freeway segments would require addition of a main-line travel lane on the freeways. There is insufficient space to implement this mitigation within the existing right-of-way. Furthermore, there is no funding mechanism in place to contribute fees to this improvement. Therefore, impacts to freeway facilities are ***significant and unavoidable***.

Many of the freeway segments will operate at an unacceptable level, and the Project adds traffic to these facilities. Therefore, there are Project-level impacts and cumulative impacts to the freeway system near the Project site. To mitigate the impacts at the identified locations, freeway main-line widening or freeway ramp widening would be required.

However, this type of infrastructure is extremely costly and is typically infeasible for one development project to undertake. The City cannot assure the construction of improvements to freeway facilities that may be needed to improve traffic flow. Furthermore, Caltrans does not have any funding mechanism in place to allow development projects to contribute a fair-share payment to contribute to future improvements and off-set cumulatively considerable traffic impacts. Thus, although TRAF-6 provides a mechanism for project applicants to contribute fair share fees to Caltrans to fund improvements to the freeway ramps in the Project study area, there is no assurance that Caltrans will perform the necessary studies or that improvements will actually be constructed. Accordingly, the Project's contribution of traffic to previously identified, congested ramps under Existing plus Project and Cumulative Year 2035 With Project conditions would represent a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. Mitigation Measure TRAF-6 has been adopted and will reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. The facility is not controlled by the City, which could not guarantee implementation of the mitigation measures. Therefore, the identified impacts to the freeway system are considered ***significant and unavoidable***.

Improvements to state highway facilities are planned, funded, and constructed by the State of California through a legislative and political process involving the state legislature; the California Transportation Commission (CTC); the California Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency; Caltrans; and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA). Although potential impacts to the freeway mainline segments and ramps have been evaluated, implementation of the transportation improvements to Caltrans facilities listed above is the primary responsibility of Caltrans. Caltrans has recognized that private development has a role to play in funding fair share improvements to impacts

on these facilities, but neither Caltrans nor the state has adopted a program that can ensure that locally contributed impact fees will be tied to improvements to freeway mainlines, and only Caltrans has jurisdiction over mainline improvements. Because Caltrans has exclusive control over state highway improvements, ensuring that developer fair share contributions to mainline improvements are actually part of a program tied to implementation of mitigation is within the jurisdiction of Caltrans. However, a number of programs are in place in Los Angeles County to improve and upgrade the regional transportation system. These include the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), Interregional Improvement Program (IIP), and Caltrans Traffic Operations Strategies, State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). State and federal fuel taxes generate most of the funds used to pay for these improvements. Funds expected to be available for transportation improvements are identified through a fund estimate prepared by Caltrans and adopted by the CTC. These funds, along with other fund sources, are deposited in the state highway account to be programmed and allocated to specific project improvements in both the STIP and SHOPP by the CTC. However, if these programs are not implemented by the agencies with the responsibility to do so, the project's freeway ramp and mainline impacts would remain significant and unmitigated.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR. These changes are identified in the form of the mitigation measures above. The City of Long Beach hereby finds that implementation of the mitigation measures is feasible, and the measures are therefore adopted.

The City finds that there are no other mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, that such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency (i.e., Caltrans, California Coastal Commission, or City of Seal Beach) and not the agency making the finding, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (2), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed Project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

Impact 5.16-3:	Project-related trip generation in combination with existing and proposed cumulative development would result in designated road and/or highways exceeding county congestion management agency service standards. [Threshold T-2]

Support for this environmental impact conclusion is fully discussed in Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*, starting on page 5.16-53 of the Recirculated DEIR.

The CMP was created statewide as a result of Proposition 111 and has been implemented locally by Metro. The CMP in effect in Los Angeles County was issued by Metro in 2010 and requires that the traffic impact of individual development projects of potential regional significance be analyzed. The CMP system comprises a specific system of arterial roadways plus all freeways, and 164 intersections are identified for monitoring on the system in Los Angeles County. The CMP locations in the study area are the intersections of:

- Pacific Coast Highway & 7th Street
- Pacific Coast Highway & 2nd Street

According to the CMP Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines developed by Metro, a traffic impact analysis is required if a proposed project would add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to a CMP intersection, including freeway on- or off-ramps. For CMP-designated intersections, the acceptable LOS is E.

Since the Los Angeles CMP guidelines use the ICU methodology for assessing CMP locations, the V/C ratio was used for this analysis. If the proposed Project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2 percent of capacity ($V/C \geq 0.02$), causing LOS F ($V/C > 1.00$), a significant impact would occur. If the facility is already at LOS F, a significant impact occurs if the proposed Project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2 percent of capacity ($V/C \geq 0.02$).

According to Table 5.16-16 in the Recirculated DEIR, the CMP study area intersections of Pacific Coast Highway at 7th Street and Pacific Coast Highway at 2nd Street operate at an acceptable LOS during the Existing (2015) scenario, but operate deficiently in the Existing With Project, Cumulative (2035) Without Project, and Cumulative (2035) With Project scenarios. Without mitigation this would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure:

Mitigation measures were considered and rejected to improve the CMP intersections of PCH at 7th Street and at 2nd Street to an acceptable LOS (see Section 8 of the TIA in Appendix J1 of the Recirculated DEIR). Although these improvements would mitigate the impact to an acceptable LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours, development exists on all four quadrants of the intersections, and sufficient right-of-way does not exist. Since these intersections exceed the minimum standard of LOS E and no feasible mitigation is available, the Los Angeles CMP requires a deficiency plan. This plan includes improvement measures to implement at the intersection or TDM techniques that would decrease reliance on single-occupant vehicles. TDM measures are required, as detailed in Project Design Feature (PDF)-1 through PDF-3.

Finding:

The City finds that there are no mitigation measures that are feasible, taking into consideration specific economic, legal, social, technological or other factors, that would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level, that such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency (i.e., Caltrans, California Coastal Commission, or City of Seal Beach) and not the agency making the finding, and further, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, as discussed in Section G of these Findings (Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(1), (3); Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(1), (2), (3)). As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable because specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits, of the proposed Project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.

F. Findings on Recirculation

CEQA requires that a lead agency recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the DEIR for public review but before certification. "Information" includes changes in the Project. Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies, amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.

Finding:

The City of Long Beach previously circulated the DEIR for the SEASP for a 60-day public review period from July 20, 2016 through September 19, 2016. The DEIR was a full scope EIR that analyzed impacts to all 17 environmental topical areas: Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The DEIR analysis determined that the proposed Project, with implementation of mitigation measures, would result in significant environmental impacts in the areas of Air Quality, Cultural Resources (Historical), Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise, and Transportation/Traffic. Environmental impact areas that would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures include: Biological Resources, Cultural Resources (Archeology, Paleontology, and Tribal Cultural), Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Noise (Operational). All other topical areas were determined to be less than significant.

Based on comments received during the DEIR public review period, new traffic information was added to the DEIR that required recirculation. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(c), the City of Long Beach recirculated the portion of the EIR that triggered the need for recirculation under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a)—Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*, and Appendix J (Traffic Reports). The Recirculated DEIR was made available for a 45-day public review period, starting on February 17, 2017, and ending April 3, 2017.

G. Findings on Project Alternatives

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on alternatives to the Project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the Project. As discussed above, the DEIR identified significant impacts in a number of categories. The following impacts could be mitigated below a level of significance: biological resources; certain cultural resources; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; and certain noise impacts. The following impacts cannot be mitigated below a level of significance: certain air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, noise, and transportation and traffic impacts.

The DEIR analyzed four alternatives to the proposed Project that could reduce some, if not all, of the impacts.

1. No Project/Adopted PD-1 (SEADIP)

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate and analyze the impacts of the "No-Project" Alternative. When the Project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the No-Project Alternative is the continuation of the plan, policy, or operation into the future. Therefore, under the No Project/Adopted PD-1(SEADIP) Alternative, the current General Plan land uses and zoning would remain in effect. All proposed changes to land uses and boundaries in the Specific Plan area would not occur. Development in accordance with the adopted PD-1 would continue to occur, allowing for a total of 5,499 residential units, 375 hotel rooms, and 3,106,610 square feet of commercial uses. This represents an increase of 441,558 square feet of commercial uses and reduction of 4,019 residential units and 50 hotel rooms compared to the proposed Project. This alternative would result in 86,564 daily trips, 3,911 in the AM Peak Hour, and 7,072 in the PM Peak Hour.

The current land use designations of the Project area are outlined in Planned Development District 1 (PD-1), which was adopted in 1977. The 1977 PD-1 divides the Project area into 33 subareas and details land uses and development standards for some of the subareas. The current PD-1 planned uses include Residential, Commercial, Public/Institutional, Parks and Recreation, Industrial, Undeveloped, Water, and Rights-of-Way (ROW). The ultimate circulation plan assumes Studebaker would be extended to connect between Shopkeeper and Second Street.

Finding:

The No Project/Adopted PD-1 (SEADIP) Alternative would reduce impacts related to air quality, GHG emissions, noise, public services, recreation, traffic, and utilities due to the decrease in residential units and overall intensity. However, this alternative would result in greater impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, and hydrology and water quality due to the increased development area into previously undeveloped areas. Impacts to land use and planning would also increase since the proposed Project provides greater consistency with local and regional plans adopted for the purpose of reducing environmental impacts. Impacts related to agriculture and forestry, historical resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, and population and housing would be similar to the proposed Project.

Implementation of the No Project/Adopted PD-1 (SEADIP) Alternative would allow development to occur in accordance with the adopted PD-1. Therefore, the vast majority of the Project objectives

would not be achieved under this alternative. Although the PD-1 provides some level of guidance for future development, it does not give equal weight to development that considers planning, environmental, and economic feasibility (Objective 1). The PD-1 does not include a flexible land use plan that provides a greater mix of uses (Objective 2). Although the PD-1 provides some level of wetland protect through development of wetland buffers and preservation requirements, it allows more development within the wetland areas and does not enhance views or creates a sense of place for the community (Objective 3). Furthermore, continuation of the adopted plan would not allow for the expansion of multimodal transportation options (Objective 4); there would be no option to increase public connectivity to open space, including the marina, other waterways, the wetlands, and parks (Objective 5); and there would be no plan for enhanced gateway and landmark locations (Objective 6).

Importantly, the No Project/Adopted PD-1 (SEADIP) Alternative would not provide any of the Project benefits that would occur with adoption of the Southeast Area Specific Plan, including enhancement of wetlands through implementation of the Wetland Conservation and Monitoring Fund (providing funds for the preservation, restoration, and maintenance of wetlands), water quality enhancement, creation of place, and revitalization in the area.

The City Council rejects the No Project/Adopted PD-1 (SEADIP) Alternative on the basis of policy and economic factors as explained herein. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21061.1; CEQA Guidelines, § 15364; see also *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417; *California Native Plant Soc. v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001; *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible this project alternative identified in the FEIR.

2. No Project/No Development Alternative

This alternative assumes the proposed Project would not be implemented, which includes adoption of the Southeast Area Specific Plan. It also assumes that no new development would occur and the Project area would be considered completely built out. Therefore, all existing land uses would remain with no additional development in the future. Some minor population growth could occur within the area, to the extent that existing residential units or units that have already been approved could accommodate additional residents (e.g., a decrease in vacancy rates). None of the impacts of the proposed Specific Plan, adverse or beneficial, would result. Future conditions within the area, except for the impacts of cumulative regional growth, would generally be the same as existing conditions.

This alternative consists of 4,079 dwelling units and 2,091,476 nonresidential square feet, resulting in a reduction of 5,439 dwelling units and 573,576 square of nonresidential square feet compared to the proposed Project. This alternative would reduce the number of residents and jobs by 8,648 people and 560 jobs compared to the proposed Project. This alternative would result in 65,731 daily trips, 3,047 in the AM Peak Hour, and 5,299 in the PM Peak Hour.

Finding:

The No Project/No Development Alternative would reduce impacts to air quality (operation), cultural resources, geology and soils, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, noise

(operation), population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. Additionally, significant and unavoidable impacts associated with construction-related air quality and noise impacts, historical resources, and traffic would be eliminated under this alternative. However, impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, and hydrology and water quality would be increased.

Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would ultimately stop any new development from occurring within the Project area beyond what is already on the ground. Therefore, none of the Project objectives would be achieved under this alternative. There would be no guiding plan for development that considers planning, environmental, and economic feasibility (Objective 1); there would be no resource preservation or the ability to provide a greater mix of uses (Objective 2); there would be no standards and guidelines to encourage development that respects the wetlands, protects views, and creates a sense of place (Objective 3); there would be no expansion of multimodal transportation options (Objective 4); there would be no option to increase public connectivity to open space, including the marina, other waterways, the wetlands, and parks (Objective 5); and there would be no plan for enhanced gateway and landmark locations (Objective 6).

Importantly, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not provide any of the Project benefits that would occur with adoption of the Specific Plan, including enhancement of wetlands through implementation of the Wetland Conservation and Monitoring Fund (providing funds for the preservation, restoration, and maintenance of wetlands), water quality enhancement, creation of place, and revitalization in the area.

The City Council rejects the No Project/No Development Alternative on the basis of policy and economic factors as explained herein. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21061.1; CEQA Guidelines, § 15364; see also *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417; *California Native Plant Soc. v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001; *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible this project alternative identified in the FEIR.

3. Reduced Intensity Alternative

The Reduced Intensity Alternative was analyzed to reduce environmental impacts related to air quality, GHG emissions, noise, and traffic. In order to make a significant reduction to traffic impacts within the Project area, the proposed Project would need to be reduced below existing conditions. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce residential development intensity by 30 percent and nonresidential development intensity by 10 percent. This alternative would reduce the number of hotel units to 375 rooms. This alternative would result in 85,964 daily trips, 4,008 in the AM Peak Hour, and 6,928 in the PM Peak Hour.

Finding:

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce impacts to the transportation system by reducing the number of vehicle trips. Vehicle trip generation would be reduced by approximately 11 percent during the day, 16 percent during the AM peak hour, and 11 percent during the PM peak hour, as

compared to the proposed Project. This alternative has the potential to eliminate two significant and unavoidable traffic impacts: #19 Seal Beach Boulevard & 2nd/Westminster Boulevard and #22 Pacific Coast Highway and Seal Beach Boulevard in the City of Seal Beach dependent upon the change that would occur in the inbound and outbound vehicle splits.

This alternative would also reduce impacts associated with air quality, GHG emissions, noise, public services, recreation, and utilities compared to the proposed Project. . Impacts related to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, and population and housing would remain the same as the proposed Project since it would involve the same mix of land uses and development area. This alternative would not increase impacts for any environmental topical area.

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, most of the proposed Project's objectives would be achieved but to a lesser extent as compared to the proposed Project. For example, the reduction in development capacity under this alternative would not be consistent with the ideas and plans presented in the proposed Project, which were generated through close coordination with existing residents, businesses, property owners, and development communities to create a sustainable, feasible, and effective plan that equally considers social (community amenities), environmental, and economic benefits (Objective 1). This alternative would not provide a greater mix of uses to the same extent as the proposed Project (Objective 2). This alternative could meet Objectives 3 through 6 relating to guideline future development, expanding multimodal transportation, providing increased connectivity to open space, and identifying gateway and landmark locations to a lesser extent than the Project.

The City Council selects the Reduced Intensity Alternative as the preferred Project alternative. This alternative includes the same height, design, mobility, public benefit and other provisions as the proposed Project but reduces the total amount of development by approximately 30 percent. This type of development cap is similar to PD-30 and would incentivize property owners to invest, upgrade and redevelop their properties with the public benefits and improvements outlined in the Specific Plan. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be able to achieve the project objectives (although to a lesser degree than the proposed Project) and is also the environmentally superior alternative, reducing traffic impacts to a level consistent with the full buildout of existing SEADIP regulations.

In order to monitor the Reduced Intensity Alternative development capacity, the City has added Section 9.2.5, *Trip Allocation for Mixed-Use Designation*, to the Specific Plan. This tracking system would monitor development within the proposed mixed-use areas by limiting new project vehicle trips to a total of 5,432 PM gross peak hour trips within 86 acres. This tracking system and PM peak hour trip cap is consistent with the assumptions analyzed under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, as updated by the Final EIR dated August 2017. This would further reduce traffic impacts associated with the proposed Project, and would not result in any new significant impacts. Changes to the Specific Plan have been fully analyzed in the FEIR and no new impacts would result from incorporation of Section 9.2.5 in the Specific Plan.

4. Reduced Building Height Alternative

The Reduced Building Height Alternative proposes a maximum of five stories in the MU-CC land uses (and MU-Marina), except under specific conditions, as outlined in Table 5-4 of the Specific Plan. Additional height may be considered for hotel or residential uses up to seven stores in the MU-CC, if it is shown that significant community amenities are provided. This alternative would eliminate this exception and require a maximum building height of five stories in this area. This alternative assumes the same buildout calculations as the proposed Project.

Finding:

The Reduced Building Height Alternative would slightly reduce impacts related to aesthetics. Impacts relating to all other environmental topics would be the same as or similar to the proposed Project. This alternative would not reduce or eliminate any significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed Project.

Implementation of the Reduced Building Height Alternative would meet most of the Project objectives. However, this alternative may provide less incentive to develop residential or hotel uses providing a less flexible land use plan (Objective 2) compared to the proposed Project.

The City Council rejects the Reduced Building Height Alternative on the basis of policy and economic factors as explained herein. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21061.1; CEQA Guidelines, § 15364; see also *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417; *California Native Plant Soc. v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001; *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible this project alternative identified in the FEIR.

III. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

After balancing the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed Project, 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 Project.

1. Implements Guiding Principles and Objectives Established for the Project

The Southeast Area Specific Plan implements a vision shaped by the following guiding principles supporting citywide efforts to enhance the aesthetics, vitality, economic value, quality of life and amenities afforded by the Project area:

1. Implement projects within the Southeast Area Specific Plan that give equal consideration to planning, environmental and economic feasibility.

2. Balance responsible growth with resource preservation through a flexible land use plan that provides a greater mix of uses and through an implementation strategy that is tailored to the local economy.

3. Provide clear standards and guidelines to encourage future development that respects the wetlands, protects views, and creates a sense of place through thoughtful building placement, form, and architectural design.

4. Expand multimodal transportation options through enhanced pedestrian and bicycle connectivity without compromising vehicular traffic flow.

5. Provide options to increase public connectivity to open space, including the marina, other waterways, the wetlands, and parks.

6. Identify and plan for enhanced gateway and landmark locations that define the entrance to the City and contribute to a sense of place for the area.

2. SEASP Enhances Wetlands and Protects Sensitive Species

Development in accordance with the Specific Plan would support the conservation, maintenance, and enhancement of the wetlands in the Los Cerritos Wetlands Complex (LCWC). The Specific Plan removes developable land uses such as residential and business park from the wetlands area and replaces them with a land use that affords more protection to the environment, "Coastal Habitat, Wetlands, and Recreation." The Coastal Habitat, Wetlands & Recreation land use designation lies entirely within the coastal zone and provides for coastal restoration, access, and visitor-serving recreation–ancillary office space, boat storage, trails, an interpretive center, access and the Shopkeeper Road extension. These uses are intended to be complementary to the surrounding habitat and consistent with the Coastal Act. The ultimate alignment of Shopkeeper Road shall not impact delineated wetlands pursuant to the Specific Plan (see SEASP Sections 4.3.8 and 6.6.8, v. Hearing Draft May 2017). While the remaining uses are intended to be developed in disturbed areas or ruderal uplands consisting of bare land or nonnative vegetation. To ensure protection of the wetlands and biological resources any project within 100 feet of LCWC is required to submit a Site Plan Review application which requires discretionary review (see SEASP Section 4.2.12).

SEASP also establishes a Wetland Conservation and Monitoring Fund (SEASP Section 5.9), which will provide revenue in perpetuity for the long-term management of the wetlands, thereby protecting native vegetation and sensitive habitats. SEASP also creates habitat separation areas or wetland buffers to protect sensitive habitat from urban uses (SEASP Section 5.10).

SEASP requires new buildings to institute bird-safe treatments (SEASP Section 7.3.14). Special design requirements have been established relating to lighting, landscaping, and façade treatments. For example, building façade treatments specify glazing materials, and building site design prohibits features that create bird traps. In addition to the building, lighting, and landscaping requirements, height limitations are required within 100 feet of a wetland (see Section 7.2.5 of the Specific Plan, *Special Edge Conditions, Wetlands Edge at Shopkeeper Road*).

The Specific Plan incorporates a number of development standards to reduce impacts to the wetlands, wildlife, sensitive birds. For example, the maximum building height at the intersection of PCH and Studebaker Road is 3 stories with the top floor stepback minimum of 10 feet at the top floor. A maximum building height of 3 stories is allowed for buildings adjacent wetlands. The Specific Plan also includes project design features to ensure non-invasive and native plant species. For example, new landscape plantings shall utilize non-invasive species (prohibited species published by the California Invasive Plant Council) and reflect native plants typically associated with wetlands into development around wetlands (SEASP Section 7.2.12). Additionally, all plant material shall comply with a specified plant palette (SEASP Appendix D) consisting of California Native species or varieties that will not invade habitat or hybridize with existing native vegetation to create a more seamless transition between the natural wetlands and development (per CalGreen and Cal-IPC standards).

3. SEASP Enhances Multimodal Connectivity in Support of State Law (AB 375, SB 743)

SEASP offers several improvements to the roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian network.

Roadways

- **Marina Drive** will have two lanes and connect Pacific Coast Highway to 2nd Street.

- **Studebaker Road/Shopkeeper Road** will have two lanes and connect Pacific Coast Highway to 2nd Street.

- **Pacific Coast Highway and Studebaker Road** westbound approach will be modified from one shared through/left/right lane to one shared through/left-turn lane and one right-turn lane. This improvement is consistent with the proposed roadway connection at Studebaker Road/Shopkeeper Road.

Bicycles

- Class I bikeway adjacent to the Los Cerritos Channel from Pacific Coast Highway to Loynes Drive
- Class II bikeway along Loynes Drive from the Long Beach Bikeway Route 10 to Studebaker Road
- Class II bikeway along 2nd Street from Pacific Coast Highway and Studebaker Road
- Class II bikeway along Shopkeeper Road from Pacific Coast Highway and 2nd Street
- Class IV bikeway along Pacific Coast Highway from the San Gabriel River bridge to Bellflower Boulevard
- Class IV bikeway along Studebaker Road from 2nd Street to SR-22 Westbound Ramps

Pedestrians

- Sidewalks on both sides of the street along Pacific Coast Highway from the San Gabriel River bridge to Bellflower Boulevard
- Sidewalks on both sides of the street along 2nd Street from Marina Drive to the Long Beach City limits
- Sidewalks on both sides of the street along Marina Drive from the Los Cerritos Channel to the San Gabriel River
- Sidewalks on both sides of the street along Studebaker Road from 2nd Street to SR-22 Westbound Ramps
- Sidewalks on one side of the street along Shopkeeper Road from Pacific Coast Highway to 2nd Street
- Sidewalks on both sides of the street along Channel Drive from Pacific Coast Highway to 7th Street
- Sidewalks on both sides of the street within the Project site adjacent to Pacific Coast Highway, Marina Drive, and 2nd Street
- Shorter block lengths in the Project area to create new internal streets improving pedestrian and bicycle circulation

In addition to the proposed vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements identified above, the Specific Plan includes a number of project design features to reduce vehicle trips. SEASP requires the City to establish a Transportation Management Association (TMA) with the authority to implement strategies pertaining to trip reduction through transportation demand management. In

January 2017, a TDM Plan was drafted to reduce reliance on automobiles, congestion and associated emissions. The TDM Plan addresses the effectiveness of TDM goals and measures; establishes the strategy to meet the TDM goals, the monitoring framework, and implementation of the TMA. The goal of the TDM Plan is to reduce Project-generated AM and PM peak hour trips by 10 percent (see Appendix J2 of the DEIR).

4. SEASP is consistent with SCAG's RTP/SCS

Senate Bill (SB) 375 requires the MPOs to prepare a sustainable communities strategy in their regional transportation plan. For the SCAG region, the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) was adopted in April 2016 (SCAG 2016).

SCAG's RTP/SCS identifies that land use strategies that focus on new housing and job growth in areas served by high quality transit and other opportunity areas would be consistent with a land use development pattern that supports and complements the proposed transportation network. The overarching strategy in the 2016 RTP/SCS is to provide for a plan that allows the southern California region to grow in more compact communities in existing urban areas; provide neighborhoods with efficient and plentiful public transit, abundant and safe opportunities to walk, bike and pursue other forms of active transportation; and preserve more of the region's remaining natural lands (SCAG 2016). The 2016 RTP/SCS contains transportation projects to help more efficiently distribute population, housing, and employment growth, as well as a forecast development that is generally consistent with regional-level general plan data. The projected regional development pattern, when integrated with the proposed regional transportation network identified in the RTP/SCS, would reduce per capita vehicular travel–related GHG emissions and achieve the GHG reduction per capita targets for the SCAG region.

The SCS outlines a development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network and other transportation measures and policies, would reduce GHG emissions from transportation (excluding goods movement). The SCS is meant to provide growth strategies that will achieve the regional GHG emissions reduction targets. However, the SCS does not require that local general plans, specific plans, or zoning be consistent with the SCS. Instead, it provides incentives to governments and developers for consistency. Through implementation of the strategies in the RTP/SCS, SCAG anticipates lowering GHG emissions below 2005 levels by 8 percent by 2020, 18 percent by 2035, and 22 percent by 2040. Land use strategies to achieve the region's targets include planning for new growth around high quality transit areas and "livable corridors," and creating neighborhood mobility areas to integrate land use and transportation and plan for more active lifestyles (SCAG 2016). Specifically, SEASP is consistent with the following SCAG RTP/SCS land us strategies:

- **Focusing new growth around High Quality Transit Areas (HQTA).** The 2016 RTP/SCS overall land use pattern reinforces the trend of focusing new housing and employment in the region's HQTAs. The 2016 RTP/SCS assumes that 46 percent of new housing and 55 percent of new employment locations developed between 2012 and 2040 will be located within HQTAs, which comprise only three percent of the total land area in the SCAG region (SCAG 2016).

Consistent: The Pacific Coast Highway corridor in SEASP is identified as HQTA. The proposed Project would increase residential land and nonresidential land use intensities within this HQTA.

SEASP would make the Pacific Coast Highway corridor more user friendly for all modes of travel, especially pedestrians and bikes. SEASP envisions the Pacific Coast Highway as a main street through the SEASP area with design elements to separate bikes from cars and pedestrians from bikes. SEASP also encourages shared, bundled, or pooled parking; off-site parking; or valet parking plans with approval from the City's Site Plan Review Committee. Projects are eligible for a parking reduction by incorporating TDM measures. SEASP also requires formation of a Transportation Management Association, whose duties include coordination of pricing for parking.

- **Plan for growth around Livable Corridors.** SCAG's livable corridors strategy seeks to revitalize commercial strips through integrated transportation and land use planning that results in increased economic activity and improved mobility options (SCAG 2016).

Consistent: Livable corridors are predominantly a subset of the HQTAs; however, 154 miles are not designated as HQTAs in SCAG's RTP/SCS. These additional miles were identified in Sustainability Planning Grant projects, which SCAG proposes for active transportation improvement. As identified above, SEASP would make the Pacific Coast Highway corridor more user friendly for all modes of travel, especially pedestrians and bikes. The two districts (Community Core and Marina) would encourage a greater mix of uses along this livable corridor. Guiding principles of SEASP include: Expand multimodal transportation options through enhanced pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and increase public connectivity to open space, including the marina, other waterways, the wetlands, and parks.

- **Provide more options for short trips in Neighborhood Mobility Areas and Complete Communities.** Neighborhood mobility areas have a high intersection density, low to moderate traffic speeds and robust residential retail connections. These areas are suburban in nature, but can support slightly higher density in targeted locations. The land use strategies include shifting retail growth from large centralized retail strip malls to smaller distributed centers throughout a neighborhood mobility area (SCAG 2016).

Consistent: The designations would provide a greater mix of uses in the Project area. SEASP would provide a mix of uses in the vicinity of 2nd and Pacific Coast Highway to capture more internal trips to the area. The shorter block lengths near 2nd Street and Pacific Coast Highway would promote walking and biking in the area. Additionally, SEASP would provide additional connectivity for bikes and pedestrians, such as bike paths and better pedestrian facilities between key destinations, so that people do not have to get in their cars to make short trips.

Overall, SEASP would be consistent with SCAG's regional goals of providing infill housing, improving the jobs-housing balance, and integrating land uses near major transportation corridors. Building upon the recommendations of the RTP/SCS, SEASP incorporates two mixed use districts—Mixed-Use Community Core and the Mixed-Use Marina—that would encourage a greater mix of uses. Guiding principles of SEASP include: expand multi-modal transportation options through enhanced pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and increase public connectivity to open space, including the marina, other waterways, the wetlands, and parks. To achieve the SEASP vision for better and safer bicycle and pedestrian facilities, envisioning Pacific Coast Highway with a "main street" feel within the area, and identify ways to make the SEASP area a destination with limited cut-through traffic, the SEASP Mobility Plan proposes:

- A mix of uses in the vicinity of 2nd and Pacific Coast Highway to capture more internal trips to the area (minimize the number of vehicular trips that require use of dedicated roadways).

- Shorter block lengths near the 2nd Street and Pacific Coast Highway intersection to promote walking and biking in the study area.

- Additional connectivity for bikes and pedestrians that connect people to their destinations, such as bike paths and better pedestrian facilities between key destinations.

- Parallel pedestrian and bicycle linkages where they can be implemented without adversely impacting wetlands resources.

- Improved biking and walking environments so that people do not have to get into their cars to make short trips.

- Additional long-term mobility options such as the implementation of a privately financed shuttle circulator that could provide access to key destinations between the SEASP area, Cal State Long Beach, the Veteran's Hospital, Belmont Shore and Naples, and possibly the Convention Center.

Implementation of SEASP would result in a decrease in VMT per service population from 45.3 VMT/SP to 36.6 VMT/SP, which is consistent with regional goals to reduce passenger VMT. Therefore, is consistent with SCAG's RTP/SCS strategies.

5. SEASP is consistent with the City of Long Beach's Sustainable City Action Plan

The City of Long Beach adopted the Sustainable City Action Plan in 2010. The City's Sustainability Action Plan is not directly applicable to projects. However, a consistency analysis of SEASP with the applicable goals in the Sustainable City Action plan is provided in Table 5.7-8 in order to demonstrate how the Specific Plan aligns with other City plans. SEASP would be consistent and would not conflict with the City's Sustainable City Action Plan as demonstrated by the applicable goals.

- Create at least six new community gardens by 2012 (City of Long Beach, 2010).

Consistent: Greenroofs, or eco-roofs, are permitted in the Specific Plan area to reduce stormwater runoff, lower energy consumption, and provide spaces for community gardens. All new development would be required to provide a minimum open space of 20 percent of the Project area. Additionally, new development within the SEASP area is required to contribute an in-lieu fee equivalent toward the City's public open space requirement, which would be applied to the creation and maintenance of parks in the City.

- Plant at least 10,000 new trees in Long Beach by 2020 (City of Long Beach, 2010).

Consistent: he SEASP would add more trees to the SEASP area as a part of the streetscape amenities identified in the Specific Plan. New streets are required to include street trees and pedestrian amenities in the Mixed-Use Community Core. Parkways are encouraged to be planted with shade trees.

Additionally, SEASP also encourages parking lots that provide sufficient tree coverage to mitigate the heat island effect. Parking structures should also be shaded and/or include photovoltaic arrays on the top deck to reduce heat island effect.

- 50 percent of Long Beach residents work in Long Beach by 2020 (City of Long Beach, 2010).

Consistent: The SEASP supports development. As identified in Section 5.13, Population and Housing, the proposed Project would make the City slightly more housing-rich, which would be consistent with the City's goal to provide additional housing opportunities in Long Beach.

- By 2020, at least 30 percent of Long Beach residents use alternative transportation to get to work (City of Long Beach, 2010).

Consistent: SEASP would provide a mix of uses in the vicinity of 2nd and Pacific Coast Highway to capture more internal trips to the area. The shorter block lengths near 2nd Street and Pacific Coast Highway would promote walking and biking in the area. Additionally, SEASP would provide additional connectivity for bikes and pedestrians, such as bike paths and better pedestrian facilities between key destinations, so that people do not have to get in their cars to make short trips.

SEASP also encourages shared, bundled, or pooled parking; off-site parking; or valet parking plans with approval from the City's Site Plan Review Committee. Projects are eligible for a parking reduction by incorporating TDM measures. SEASP also requires formation of a Transportation Management Association, whose duties include coordination of pricing for parking.

- Reduce community electricity use by 15 percent by 2020 (City of Long Beach, 2010).

Consistent: The City adopted a Green Building Policy for city buildings and is working to create a Green Building Policy for private development in the city. All new development under the SEASP would comply with the current Building and Energy Efficiency Standards, which are increasing more energy efficient. The California Energy Commission (CEC) projects that by 2020 new residential building will be required to be zero net energy, and by 2030 new nonresidential buildings will be required to be zero net energy. SEASP encourages that buildings be oriented for energy efficiency to capture day lighting, minimize heat gain, and take advantage of prevailing breezes for natural ventilation. The SEASP encourages open spaces to be appropriately landscaped and provide adequate shade devices or shade trees to reduce heat island effects. Shade devices may include umbrellas, awnings, trellises, and canopies that are integrated into the building or over open spaces.

SEASP requires use of low-contrast lighting, low-voltage fixtures, and energy-efficient bulbs, such as compact fluorescent and light emitting diode (LED) bulbs for all outdoor lighting. Additionally, SEASP encourages the use of solar-powered light fixtures. For architectural lighting, use of automatic timers is encouraged to conserve energy at night. Furthermore, the SEASP includes bird-safe measures that would result in energy co-benefits, including requirements for automated on/off systems and motion detectors for interior lighting. The SEASP also encourages building owners to participate in "Lights Out for Birds" programs or similar initiatives by turning off lighting at night.

- Reduce community natural gas use by 10 percent by 2020 (City of Long Beach, 2010).

Consistent: See above; all new development under the SEASP would comply with the current Building and Energy Efficiency Standards and the SEASP Design Standards and Guidelines.

- Increase public transit ridership by 25 percent by 2016 (City of Long Beach, 2010).

Consistent: The SEASP does not propose any changes to the existing transit routes provided by LA Metro, Long Beach Transit, or the Orange County Transportation Authority. The SEASP encourages improvements to existing transit stops in the area, upgraded concurrently with investment in the area. This would include improving bus stop areas to include benches, transit information, and shelters for transit users.

- Increase bike ridership from 1 percent to 10 percent by 2016 (City of Long Beach, 2010).

Consistent: SEASP would make the Pacific Coast Highway corridor more user friendly for all modes of travel, especially pedestrians and bikes. SEASP envisions the Pacific Coast Highway as a main street through the SEASP area with design elements to separate bikes from cars and pedestrians from bikes. Bicycle circulation is provided on streets with designated bike lanes, separated bikeways (cycle tracks), and off-street pathways as identified in the Bicycle Network.

- Create a system of at least 200 miles of interconnected bike routes (Classes 1 to 3) by 2020 (City of Long Beach, 2010).

Consistent: The Bicycle Network identified in the Specific Plan identifies proposed bicycle connections. Bicycle circulation is provided on streets with designated bike lanes, separated bikeways (cycle tracks), and off-street pathways. A new Class I facility on the north side of the Los Cerritos Channel that would connect Pacific Coast Highway to Loynes Drive if it does not impact sensitive wetlands in the area. A Class I connection is also proposed that would link this route to the existing San Gabriel Bike Trail. New Class II bikeways are proposed along the Shopkeeper Road extension to Pacific Coast Highway, Studebaker Road, and along Marina Drive. Two cycle tracks (Class IV)—one along Pacific Coast Highway and the other along Studebaker Road—are proposed for the SEASP area.

- Create 8 acres of open space per 1,000 residents by 2020 (City of Long Beach, 2010).

Consistent: The Project area currently has approximately 66 acres of parks and recreation and is adjacent to another 340 acres of parkland and recreational uses. All new development would be required to provide a minimum open space of 20 percent of the Project area. Additionally, green roofs are permitted atop buildings that face the wetlands if specified plants and animals that would be attracted to the green roof are compatible.

- Establish a native landscape demonstration in every park 1 acre or larger by 2020 (City of Long Beach, 2010).

Consistent: Projects within SEASP are required to adhere to the landscaping standards in Chapter 21.42, Landscaping Standards, of the zoning code. Projects within SEASP are also required to be drought tolerant and feature native wetland plants to create a seamless transition between the natural wetlands and development.

- Reduce per capita use of potable water, exceeding the State mandate to achieve a demand reduction of 20 percent in per capita water use by the year 2020 (City of Long Beach, 2010).

Consistent: All new developments under the SEASP would include water efficiency improvements required under CALGreen and the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. Landscaping is required to be drought tolerant and feature native wetland plants to create a more seamless transition between the natural wetlands and development. Landscaping for projects (including right-of-way medians) within SEASP shall be consistent with the provisions of Chapter 21.42, Landscape Standards, in the Zoning Code. Landscaping shall be consistent with Title 21 Standards as well. For Mixed-Use Community Core and Mixed-Use Marina, the provisions of Chapter 21.42.040, Landscaping Standards, for R-3, R-4, and Nonresidential Districts shall apply. Furthermore, the Long Beach Water Department obtains recycled water from the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County's Water Reclamation Plant within the SEASP boundary; two recycled water connections currently serve Marina Vista Park and Will Rogers Mini Park. At this time, the recycled water supply is 100 percent allocated to existing demand.

6. SEASP allows development of housing units that would meet the goals and policies of the City's Housing Element and contribute towards the City's RHNA requirements

As detailed in the City of Long Beach 2013-2021 Housing Element, the City's RHNA allocation for the 2013–2021 period is shown in Table 5.13-4 of the DEIR. In total, the City is required to provide 7,048 units ranging from extremely low income to above moderate income units. While the SEASP does not explicitly identify whether the proposed residential units would be affordable or market rate housing, it does increase residential development potential that would attract developers to build housing in the Project area. Thus, ensuring sufficient sites within Long Beach are planned and zoned for housing to meet the City's Housing Element and RHNA requirements.

Additionally, the proposed Project would meet the following applicable goals and policies of the City's Housing Element.

Goal 3: Retain and Improve the Quality of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods

- Policy 3.1 Encourage the maintenance and improvement of the housing stock and the neighborhood context.

- Policy 3.2 Preserve and protect the character of established neighborhoods, with an emphasis on single-family neighborhoods and those beginning to decline.

- Policy 3.5 Continue to improve streets and drainage, sidewalks and alleys, green spaces and parks, street trees, and other public facilities, amenities and infrastructure.

- Policy 3.6 Continue to preserve and maintain the City's historical and architecturally significant buildings and neighborhoods by establishing and maintaining historic landmarks and districts

Goal 4: Provide Increased Opportunities for the Construction of High Quality Housing

- Policy 4.1 Provide adequate sites, zoned at the appropriate densities and development standards, to facilitate the housing production and affordability goals set forth in the 2014-2021 RHNA.

- Policy 4.2 Encourage a balance of rental and homeownership opportunities, including high quality apartments, townhomes, condominiums, and single-family homes to accommodate the housing needs of all socioeconomic segments of the community, including large families.

- Policy 4.3 Encourage new high quality rental and ownership housing through the implementation of design review guidelines, and architectural and green building standards.

- Policy 4.5 Encourage residential development along transit corridors, in the downtown and close to employment, transportation and activity centers; and encourage infill and mixed-use developments in designated districts.

7. SEASP increases economic activity in the Project area, consistent with the City of Long Beach's Economic Development Blueprint

The City is in the process of approving an Economic Development Blueprint that provides policy recommendations to drive economic growth over the next ten years. The draft blueprint has been prepared and is currently under review. The Long Beach Economic Development Blueprint embodies strategies to strengthen the City's core economic engines, nurture and grow new innovative industries, and foster economic inclusion in low income communities. The Blueprint is intended as a "call to action" for additional research, community engagement, and dialogue to define more specific strategies, policies, and programs to advance economic opportunities throughout Long Beach. The Blueprint establishes the following goals:

- Make Long Beach a leader in education and business expansion, retention, and growth.

- Ensure that our economy provides at least one fulfilling job opportunity for every resident and student in Long Beach who wants one.

- Develop a civic and economic culture that provides every aspiring entrepreneur in Long Beach access to the resources and markets they need in order to startup and stay in business.

- Ensure through action that Long Beach is recognized as one of the world's most livable, inventive, and inclusive cities.

The Economic Development Blueprint Focus Areas include: 1. Engines of Growth, 2. Economic Inclusion, 3. Jobs & Workforce Development, 4. Business Assistance, 5. Development Environment, 6. Quality of Life, and 7. Economic Leadership & Cooperation

The SEASP Project would support the City's Blueprint by increasing economic activity in the Project area. A market assessment was prepared for the Specific Plan to determine what revisions to the existing zoning would be needed to create development opportunities that would implement the community vision for the SEASP area. The market assessment concluded that the SEASP area is an attractive location or housing growth because of its higher-income demographics, easy access to jobs in the region, and diverse recreation opportunities. With its location and demographics, the SEASP area also has a strong, competitive existing retail concentration and can attract higher end retail and restaurants. Retail demand in the area is driven by projected household growth in the market area; therefore, the proposed increase in housing units and commercial square footage in the Specific Plan

area would enhance economic activity in the area. Additionally, tourism and the number of conventions held in the City of Long Beach are growing. The increase in hotel development potential under the Specific Plan would attract new hotel developments, both small boutique hotels and larger full-service hotels. Overall, SEASP would increase residential and nonresidential development potential in the area to meet the growing market demand for housing, retail/commercial, and hotel uses in the coming years.

8. The Project creates an interesting, dynamic environment with public and private amenities and hotel rooms, consistent with Coastal Act goals of bringing visitors to the coast

The SEASP area is uniquely located near the waterfront and serves as a destination for residents and visitors. Key project priorities related to enhancing public and private amenities in the Specific Plan area include improving public access to open spaces (i.e., marina, waterways, wetlands, and parks), enhancing and restoring the wetlands, improving bicycle and pedestrian transportation options throughout the Project area, creating a gateway to Long Beach, and creating a greater mix of land uses that appeals to a diverse population. Specifically, the corridor views along Studebaker Road, 2nd Street and PCH would be enhanced with open edge views, gateway signage and landscaping, and view recovery opportunities of the wetlands and bay. Chapter 7 (Design Standards and Guidelines) of the Specific Plan provides urban design guidelines to enhance and utilize the Project's corridors, edges and pathways. Additionally, proposed streetscape amenities along PCH, the marina/waterway promenade and wetlands edge at Shopkeeper Road would contribute towards improving the quality and character of these public areas.

As stated above, the market assessment prepared for the Specific Plan identified an increase in tourism and the number of conventions in Long Beach in the future. Occupancy at existing Long Beach hotels is strong and the SEASP area's waterfront would be a desirable location or new hotel development. The selected Reduced Intensity Development Alternative would increase hotel development potential by 375 hotel rooms and help attract more visitors to Long Beach.

The proposed Project would also be consistent with the following Coastal Act goals:

- Public Access in New Development Projects (Section 30212)

Consistent: Public access to wetlands and water areas within the SEASP is a fundamental feature of placemaking in the Project area. New pedestrian and bike linkages are proposed throughout the Project area to close gaps in the existing bike and pedestrian network and in many cases link the public to views from the edges of the Los Cerritos Wetlands.

- Public Access (Section 30214)

Consistent: The proposed location of bike and pedestrian trails within SEASP provides public access to the perimeter of the Los Cerritos Wetlands. Access within wetland areas will be determined at a later date based on factors such as the fragility of the natural resources in the area, the proximity of access points to adjacent uses, and wetlands restoration efforts currently underway that will determine if access within the wetlands is feasible.

- Private lands; priority of development purposes (Section 30222)

Consistent: The Mixed-Use Marina and Mixed-Use Community Core uses encourage the inclusion of hospitality use to support public access to the wetland areas. New residential uses will also help to bring additional housing choices to the Project area, and are intended to be combined with hospitality and retail uses to create an active, pedestrian friendly environment.

- Maintenance and enhancement of public access (Section 30252)

Consistent: One of the primary goals of the SEASP Vision is to provide alternative means to get around the Project area other than the car. Transit stops along PCH, new cycle tracks along PCH and Studebaker Road, and the trails adjacent to the San Gabriel River all help to reduce automobile circulation within the Project area and maintain and enhance public access to the coast. The SEASP limits new development in the majority of the area so as to target future growth in the Mixed Use Community Core and Mixed Use Marina areas. These areas allow for a mix of residential, hospitality and retail uses in a focused area of the SEASP area that will include new internal streets, pedestrian paseos, plaza spaces and boardwalks along the waterways.

9. SEASP will help stabilize the City's fiscal position by replacing an outdated retail model, assuring the existing built environment does not decline while providing flexibility to allow for creative and productive use of real estate

Existing retail in the SEASP area is dominated by the Marina Pacifica Mall and Marketplace Long Beach shopping centers, which contain approximately 600,000 square feet of retail and account for nearly three percent of citywide taxable retail sales. Because of high median incomes in the Project area, strong regional access and visibility from surface streets, retail succeeds in the SEASP area and retail demand will grow by approximately 1.7 million square feet between 2010 and 2035. The proposed Specific Plan takes advantage of the anticipated growth in retail demand by focusing growth in the Mixed Use Community Core and Mixed Use Marina areas. These areas are envisioned as the primary and secondary activity centers and would provide a mix of uses, including residential, regional and neighborhood retail, hotel, office, visitor serving recreation, and marina uses. Design guidelines for the proposed paseos, promenades and main streets would attract new retail uses and create creative public spaces that draw residents and visitors to these activity centers. For example, plazas/courtyards with various public amenities, step-back designed mixed-use buildings, and strategic block patterns would break up the monotony of existing retail buildings (i.e., big box stores) helping to revitalize underutilized retail space.

IV. REFERENCES

California Council on Science and Technology (CCST). 2012, September. California's Energy Future: Portraits of Energy Systems for Meeting Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets. http://www.ccst.us/publications/2012/2012ghg.pdf.

California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2014. California Important Farmland Finder. http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html.

———. 2013. Los Angeles County Williamson Act FY 2012/2013 (map). ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA_12_13_WA.pdf.

California Department of Finance (DOF). 2014, May 1. Report E-5: Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, January 1, 2011-2014, with 2010 Benchmark. http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-5/2011-20/view.php.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2012, May. Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA. http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/los_angeles/LosAngelesCounty.pdf.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2002, February. Transportation Related Earthborne Vibration (Caltrans Experiences). Division of Environmental Analysis. Technical Advisory, Vibration. TAV-02-01-R9601. Prepared by Rudy Hendricks.

———. 2011, September 7. California Scenic Highway Mapping System – Riverside County. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm.

———. 2015. Scenic Highway Program Frequently Asked Questions. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/faq.htm.

California Gas and Electric Utilities (CGEU). 2014, July. 2014 California Gas Report. http://www.socalgas.com/regulatory/documents/cgr/2014-cgr.pdf.

California Geological Survey (CGS). 1999a, March 25. State of California Seismic Hazard Zones: Los Alamitos Quadrangle. http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/quad/LOS_ALAMITOS/maps/ozn_lalmi.pdf.

———. 1999b, March 25. State of California Seismic Hazard Zones: Long Beach Quadrangle. http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/quad/LONG_BEACH/maps/ozn_longb.pdf.

———. 1999c, March 25. State of California Seismic Hazard Zones: Seal Beach Quadrangle. http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/quad/SEAL_BEACH/maps/ozn_sealb.pdf.

Emergency Planning Consultants (EPC). 2014, June 10. Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan for the City of Long Beach.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA). 2006, May. *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*. United States Department of Transportation. FTA-VA-90-1003-06.

Long Beach, City of. 2015. City of Long Beach Municipal Code (as amended). https://www.municode.com/library/ca/long_beach/codes/municipal_code.

———. 2004, October 19. City of Long Beach Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan. http://www.hazardmitigation.calema.ca.gov/docs/lhmp/Long_Beach_City_of_LHMP.pdf

Los Alamitos, City of (CLA). 2015, March 23. "JFTB Impact Zones." Figure 6 of "Public Facilities and Safety Element." In Los Alamitos General Plan.

Moffat & Nichol. 2007, April. Tsunami Hazard Assessment for the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles. https://www.portoflosangeles.org/DOC/REPORT_Tsunami_%20April_2007.pdf.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2012, April 19. Integrated Growth Forecast. http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/index.htm.

This page intentionally left blank.