

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

**BELMONT POOL REVITALIZATION PROJECT**

**STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2013041063**

**I. BACKGROUND**

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

**A. PROJECT SUMMARY**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **B. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **C. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

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

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



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

## **D. CUSTODIAN AND LOCATION OF RECORDS**

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

## **II. FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

### **Aesthetics**

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

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

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

## Air Quality

**Impact: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.** Because of the region's nonattainment status for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>), if Project-generated emissions of either of the O<sub>3</sub> precursor pollutants (i.e., reactive organic gases [ROG] and nitrogen oxides [NO<sub>x</sub>]), PM<sub>2.5</sub>, or PM<sub>10</sub> exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) significance thresholds, then the proposed Project would be considered to conflict with the attainment plans. However, the proposed Project would not result in significant operational air quality impacts, contribute to an O<sub>3</sub> exceedance at a nearby monitoring station, or cause the area to be inconsistent with the regional Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Furthermore, because the proposed Project does not require a General Plan Amendment and is consistent with the current site's General Plan land use designation, emissions associated with the proposed Project are not anticipated to exceed the General Plan projections or contribute to air quality deterioration beyond SCAQMD projections. The proposed Project would, however, be required to adhere to Standard Conditions 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, which include a variety of measures aimed at controlling dust during Project construction, consistent with the General Plan Air Quality Element Policy 6.1. In addition, the proposed Project would be built to meet LEED Gold certification standards (or the equivalent) and would implement a variety of conservation and sustainability features aimed at reducing energy consumption, consistent with General Plan policies. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan and Final 2012 AQMP, and related impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

**Impact: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.**

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

**Other Criteria Pollutants.** Carbon monoxide (CO) and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions during construction and operation would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds or applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less than significant air quality impacts related to CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, or other criteria pollutants and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

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

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

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



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

**Impact: Result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant air quality impact.** The cumulative study area for air quality analysis is the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), and air quality conformance is overseen by the SCAQMD. Each project in the Basin is required to comply with SCAQMD rules and regulations. The proposed Project would not result in significant operational air quality impacts, contribute to an O<sub>3</sub> exceedance at a nearby monitoring station, be in noncompliance with the AQMP, or result in a significant health risk for any of the analyzed pollutants. Therefore, the proposed Project's air quality emissions, when considered in combination with the cumulative projects within the Project vicinity, would be incremental and would be considered less than cumulatively considerable. No mitigation would be required.

## **Biological Resources**

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

## Geology and Soils

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

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

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

## Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

**Impact: Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.** The GHG emissions reduction goals in Assembly Bill (AB 32) are scoped to manage total statewide GHG emissions of approximately 496.95 million metric tons (MMT) of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. The proposed Project is estimated to produce approximately 1,600 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year over existing conditions, representing approximately 0.002 MMT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year of the State's reduction goals. Therefore, the proposed Project is not considered to result in GHG emission levels that would substantially conflict with implementation of the GHG reduction goals under AB 32, Executive Order (EO) S-03-05, or other State regulations. The proposed Project would have a less than significant impact related to potential conflicts with regulations outlined in the California Green Buildings Standard Code and GHG emissions reduction goals in AB 32. No mitigation is required.

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

significance; and the proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. As a result, the proposed Project's climate change impacts with regard to GHG emissions would not be considered cumulatively considerable because they would not contribute to GHG emissions that exceed the AB 32 Statewide reduction goals. Additionally, the proposed Project's long-term operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD daily thresholds. The proposed Project would result in a GHG emission profile that would not exceed the Tier 3 criterion of 3,000 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year for commercial/residential projects, and is lower than the service population thresholds as allowed under Tier 4 analysis (4.8 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year per service population). Additionally, since climate change is a global issue, it is unlikely that the proposed Project would generate enough GHG emissions to influence global climate change on its own. Therefore, the contribution of the proposed Project GHG emissions to potential cumulative GHG emission impacts in the City of Long Beach is considered less than cumulatively significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

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

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Land Use

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Noise

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Recreation

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

## Transportation and Circulation

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

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



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

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

## Utilities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Aesthetics**

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

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



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

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

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

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

## **Biological Resources**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Cultural Resources

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Geology and Soils

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

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

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

Specific requirements in the Final Geotechnical Report shall address:

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

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

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

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

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