

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

LONG BEACH GENERAL PLAN LAND USE AND URBAN DESIGN ELEMENTS PROJECT

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2015051054

I. BACKGROUND

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

A. PROJECT SUMMARY

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

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

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

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

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

In total, the LUE proposes changes to approximately 13 percent of the land area (or the equivalent of 4,180 acres) in the City. The establishment of PlaceTypes in place of standard parcel-by-parcel land use designations would allow for greater flexibility in development types to create distinct residential neighborhoods, employment centers, and open space areas.

Urban Design Element. The UDE would be an entirely new element of the City's General Plan and would replace the existing SRE upon approval by the City Council. The decision to include a UDE in the City's General Plan grew from the City's stated need to provide an urban framework that addresses the varying aesthetic characteristics associated with the historic districts, traditional neighborhoods, auto-oriented commercial centers, urbanized centers, and corridors located throughout the City.

The UDE would define the physical aspects of the urban environment. Specifically, the UDE aims to further enhance the City's PlaceTypes established in the LUE by creating great places; improving the urban fabric, and public spaces; and defining edges, thoroughfares, and corridors.

Project Objectives

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

1. Promote livability, including environmental quality, community health and safety, the quality of the built environment, and economic vitality.
2. Accommodate strategic growth in the Downtown area, around regional-serving facilities, along major corridors, and in transit-oriented development areas; create and preserve open space; accommodate economic development by converting industrial areas to neo-industrial uses in appropriate locations, promote regional-serving uses, convert industrial uses to commercial uses in locations more suitable for commercial character, and revitalize the Waterfront areas.
3. Implement sustainable planning and development practices by creating compact new developments and walkable neighborhoods to minimize the City's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) and energy usage.
4. Create job growth allowing for new businesses while also maintaining and preserving existing employment opportunities at the City's regional facilities and employment centers. Promote increased

employment opportunities for Long Beach residents at differing levels of educational and skill attainment.

5. Promote changes in land use and development that reflect changes in the regional economy. Promote land uses that transform now-vacant former employment centers into new sources of employment.
6. Meet the City's housing needs by diversifying housing opportunities through the provision of a variety of housing types and the provision of market-rate and affordable housing units.
7. Provide high-quality housing in a variety of forms, sizes, and densities to serve the diverse population of the City.
8. Preserve low-density neighborhoods while improving pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access in these areas.
9. Ensure fair and equitable land use by making planning decisions that would ensure the fair and equitable distribution of services, amenities, and investments throughout the City.
10. Provide reliable public facilities and infrastructure by expanding and maintaining the current infrastructure to serve new and existing developments in the City.
11. Increase access to green and open space through the creation of urban open spaces and greenscapes and providing for clean beaches, waterways, preserves, and parklands.
12. Restore and reconnect with local natural reserves through the utilization of clean energy, best management practices (BMPs), and current technologies.
13. Create "Great Places" areas by improving the connectivity, the visual appearance of and development of public spaces; promote sustainable design practices; encourage design techniques that foster economic development; preserve historic districts and the unique character of each neighborhood; provide for public art; and expand the unified sign program to increase wayfinding within neighborhoods and PlaceTypes.
14. Improve the urban fabric by creating complete neighborhoods and community blocks, properly place and design new development to prevent visual and land use conflicts; promote compact urban and infill development, clearly define boundaries between natural and urbanized areas, preserve iconic buildings; and provide pedestrian furniture and wide sidewalks to create walkable blocks.
15. Preserve the City's natural features, open space, and parks throughout the City, while also providing new public spaces throughout the community, parks, and plazas at infill sites, and parklets along sidewalks.
16. Encourage building form and design to improve the interface between buildings and streets; develop areas along public sidewalks that promote streets as "public rooms;" design parking lots and access points to be pedestrian-friendly; provide buffers along streetscapes to buffer parking areas and promote walkability; provide bicycle infrastructure; establish safe transit infrastructure; and design streetscapes utilizing sustainable streetscape strategies.
17. Promote high-quality design of the built environment. Enhance visual interest, improve functionality and inspire pride through thoughtful design, high-quality materials, and a diversity of architectural styles throughout neighborhoods and the entire City.

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

B. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

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

- The City prepared an Initial Study (IS) for the proposed project to determine the level of environmental documentation required for the proposed project. The analysis contained in the IS found that the project may result in significant environmental impacts without the implementation of mitigation. As such, City staff determined that an EIR was the appropriate environmental document to be prepared for the proposed project. The IS was prepared and circulated, along with a Notice of Preparation (NOP), from May 18 to June 16, 2015. A public Scoping Meeting was held on May 27, 2015, in order to present the project and to receive public comments on the IS. Chapter 2.0, Introduction, of the Draft EIR, describes the issues identified for analysis in the Draft EIR based on the analysis included in the IS, the NOP, and from soliciting public comments.
- The City conducted two study sessions on June 4, 2016, and October 6, 2016, to introduce the project to the City's Planning Commission, discuss the programmatic requirements and conceptual plans for the proposed project, and engage citizen participation in developing the proposed project.
- The City prepared a Draft EIR, which was made available for a 78-day public review period, from September 1 to November 18, 2016. The City prepared a Final EIR, including the Response 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 in the form of an Errata, 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 IS/NOP and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with 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 any noticed public hearings for the proposed project;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);
- The reports and technical memoranda included or referenced in the Response to Comments;
- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in the Draft EIR and Final EIR;
- The Final EIR for the proposed project;

- The Resolutions adopted by the City in connection with the proposed project, and all documents incorporated by reference therein, including comments received after the close of the comment period and responses thereto;
- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including but not limited to federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings; and
- Any other relevant materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21167.6(e).

D. CUSTODIAN AND LOCATION OF RECORDS

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

II. FINDINGS OF FACT

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

As a result of the IS that was circulated with the NOP by the City on May 18, 2015, the City determined, based upon the threshold criteria for significance, that the proposed project would not result in significant potential environmental impacts in several areas; therefore, the City determined that these potential environmental effects would not be addressed in 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. Although Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) is designated as an Eligible State Scenic Highway, it has not been officially designated as a Scenic Route or Scenic Highway. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the damage of scenic resources within a State Scenic highway. No impacts are anticipated.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources. The City is highly urbanized and is almost entirely developed. There are no areas in the City that are designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. In addition, there are no areas currently zoned, designated, or used for agricultural uses. Additionally, no Williamson Act contracts exist within the City. Furthermore, the proposed project would not introduce strictly agricultural PlaceTypes, and no new agricultural land uses or zones would be created following project approval. Furthermore, no areas in the City are zoned or used as forest land, timberland, or for timberland production. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use nor would it result in the conversion of forest land to a non-forest land use. No impacts are anticipated.

Biological Resources: Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species. The proposed project would establish the Open Space PlaceType, which would encourage the preservation of existing open space

areas and would include a variety of goals, policies, and implementation strategies aimed at preserving natural habitats in the City. The proposed LUE would also encourage the creation and expansion of wildlife habitat along the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and the coastline, which would further minimize impacts to existing sensitive species. Furthermore, because the project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements, the project would not result in impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species. No impacts are anticipated.

Biological Resources: Riparian, Sensitive Natural Communities, Wetlands. The proposed project would establish goals, policies, and implementation strategies aimed at improving and maintaining existing riparian and sensitive habitat in the City. The proposed project is also a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in impacts to a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities 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: Migratory Fish or Wildlife Species or Established Migratory Corridors. The proposed project would establish the Open Space PlaceType, which would encourage the preservation and re-establishment of existing wildlife habitat areas in the City. The establishment of the Open Space PlaceType would serve to maintain existing wildlife movement corridors. The proposed project is also a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in impacts to migratory species or established migratory corridors. No impacts are anticipated.

Biological Resources: Conflict with any Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resource (i.e., Tree Preservation Policy/Ordinance). The proposed project is also a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in the removal of any trees or be in conflict with any City biological policies or ordinances. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*, and would be required to obtain ministerial permits for any proposed tree removals on City-owned property. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in potential conflicts with the City's tree preservation policy. No impacts are anticipated.

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

Cultural Resources: Historic Resources. The proposed project would aim to encourage new development while preserving the character of federal, State, and City-designated historic buildings and neighborhoods throughout the City. The proposed project is also a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in impacts to historic resources in the City. As a result, the proposed project would not cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in PRC Section 15064.5. Additionally, future individual projects resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*, and would be reviewed to determine whether any potential historic resources would be impacted. No impacts are anticipated.

Cultural Resources: Archaeological Resources. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in impacts to archaeological resources in the City. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA*

Guidelines. As a result, the proposed project would not result in impacts to archaeological resources as defined in PRC Section 15064.5. No impacts are anticipated.

Cultural Resources: Paleontological Resources. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in impacts to paleontological resources in the City. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. As a result, the proposed project would not result in impacts to paleontological resources as defined in PRC Section 15064.5. No impacts are anticipated.

Cultural Resources: Human Remains. While the City is known to have several areas that are considered to be sensitive for cultural resources, the proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would result in the disturbance of human remains in the City. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. The City would also notify Native American representatives of future projects occurring as a result of project approval to further minimize impacts associated with the potential disturbance of unknown human remains. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts as a result of surface fault rupture. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Strong Seismic Ground Shaking. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts as a result of strong seismic ground shaking. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Liquefaction. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts as a result of liquefaction. Furthermore, future individual projects resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Landslides. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts as a result of landslides. Furthermore, future individual projects resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Soil Erosion. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts associated with soil erosion due to a loss of topsoil. Furthermore, future individual projects resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and

would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Furthermore, future projects on sites larger than one acre would also be required to comply with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program's General Construction Permit (which requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to further ensure that no impacts with respect to soil erosion occur. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Unstable Soils. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts as a result of unstable soils. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. No impacts are anticipated.

Geology and Soils: Expansive Soils. The proposed project would not include any physical improvements that would be subjected to impacts as a result of expansive soils. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would be required to comply with City requirements established in the General Plan Seismic Safety Element (1988), comply with current building codes, and would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. No impacts are anticipated.

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

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Hazardous Materials. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in impacts associated with the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. As a result, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the routine transport, use and/or disposal of hazardous materials; would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment due to the release of hazardous materials; and would not emit hazardous emissions or release hazardous materials into the environment within 0.25 mile of a school. No impacts are anticipated.

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

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Public Airports. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in impacts associated with safety hazards for people residing or working within 2 miles of a public airport. Although the proposed project would

allow for greater building heights and intensity within the City, future development surrounding the Long Beach Airport would be developed at a height consistent with applicable Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight standards. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to safety hazards resulting from conflicts with existing air traffic patterns at a public airport. No impacts are anticipated.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Private Airports. There are no private airports or private airstrips within the City or in areas directly adjacent to the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect or be affected by aviation activities associated with private airports or airstrips. No impacts are anticipated.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Emergency Response Plan. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in conflicts associated with an adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*, and would also be required to comply with the City's General Plan Public Safety Element (1978). Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the impairment or interference with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. No impacts are anticipated.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Wildland Fires. The City is almost entirely developed and there are no properties adjacent to wildlands. In addition, the City is not listed by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) as a community at risk to impacts associated with wildfire. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death associated with wildland fires. No impacts are anticipated.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Water Quality/Violation of Water Quality Standards. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in the violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the violation of water quality standards and/or waste discharge requirements. No impacts are anticipated.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Groundwater. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in the substantial depletion of groundwater supplies. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge such there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table. No impacts are anticipated.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Drainage and Runoff. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in the alteration of drainage patterns and/or the alteration of the course of a stream or river, nor would the project result in the generation of stormwater runoff, or otherwise degrade water quality. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts

related to the alteration of drainage patterns, the alteration of the course of a stream or river, and/or the generation of stormwater runoff. No impacts are anticipated.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Flooding. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would be subject to flooding impacts due to the placement of housing within a 100-year flood zone or flooding impacts as a result of the failure of a levee and/or a dam. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in flooding impacts due to the placement of housing within a 100-year flood zone or flooding impacts as a result of the failure of a levee and/or a dam. No impacts are anticipated.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Inundation. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would be subject to inundation resulting from a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in inundation impacts resulting from a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No impacts are anticipated.

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

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

Mineral Resources. According to the City's General Plan Conservation Element (1973), the primary mineral resources within the City have historically been oil and natural gas. However, over the last century, oil and natural gas extractions have diminished as the resources have become increasingly depleted. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any physical improvements that would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of a State. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the loss of mineral resources. No impacts are anticipated.

Noise: Located within an Airport Land Use Plan or within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip. The proposed project would establish the Regional-Serving Facility PlaceType adjacent to the Long Beach Airport. Allowable uses within this PlaceType include medical centers, higher education campuses, public utility facilities, destination retail centers, and other similar uses. While the project would allow for such uses within this PlaceType, the proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include any

physical improvements that would result in the exposure of people or workers to excessive noise levels generated from the Long Beach Airport. Furthermore, future individual projects resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the excessive generation of noise for people residing or working near the Long Beach Airport. Additionally, there are no private airports located within or adjacent to the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the exposure of people working or residing near a private airport to excessive noise levels. No impacts are anticipated.

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

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

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

Recreation. The proposed project would establish the Open Space PlaceType, which would preserve existing parks and recreational facilities in the City, while also creating additional parks and urban open spaces. The proposed project would allow for parks and recreation uses in several of the PlaceTypes. The Open Space PlaceType also includes policies encouraging the creation of smaller parks in more urban areas of the City to improve the equitable distribution of parks available to residents and visitors in the City. Furthermore, future individual projects resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in physical improvements that would generate an increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities nor would the project result in impacts related to the increased use and/or deterioration of recreational facilities. No impacts are anticipated.

Transportation/Traffic: Result in a Change in Air Traffic Patterns. Although the proposed project would allow for the intensification, redistribution, and development of currently underdeveloped parcels with

higher-density development, future development occurring as a result of project approval would be consistent with all FAA regulation zones and would not interfere with existing air traffic patterns at the Long Beach Airport. Furthermore, future individual projects resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not 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 is a planning/policy action and would not include the physical development of any project that would substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. The proposed project also establishes land use compatibility strategies for each PlaceType to reduce the potential for land use incompatibilities following project implementation. Furthermore, future individual projects resulting from project approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). No impacts are anticipated.

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

Transportation/Traffic: Conflicts with Alternative Transportation. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include the physical development of any project that would conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation. Further, the proposed project would encourage development along transit corridors and major transit routes to minimize vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) and encourage alternative modes of transportation. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in conflicts with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting the use of alternative transportation. No impacts are anticipated.

Utilities/Service Systems: Comply with Regulations Related to Solid Waste. The proposed project is a planning/policy action and would not include the physical development of any project that could result in the generation of solid waste. Future individual projects resulting from project approval would also be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*, and would be required to comply with existing and future statutes and regulations mandated by City, State, or federal law. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in conflicts with any adopted regulations related to solid waste. No impacts are anticipated.

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

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

Aesthetics

Impact: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. There are no City-designated scenic viewpoints or scenic corridors in the City. However, the City's existing Open Space Element requires protection of scenic features in the City, including beaches, bluffs, wetlands, and water bodies. Due to the prominence of existing urban and industrial developments adjacent to the Pacific Ocean and the Port of Long Beach, views of these resources would not be significantly altered by development envisioned under the proposed project. Further, future development facilitated by project approval would be designed according to the development strategies, policies, and standards in the proposed UDE. The proposed UDE includes development strategies and policies that consider the context of existing scenic vistas and neighborhoods when designing and implementing projects. Therefore, project-related impacts on scenic vistas would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. There are no City-designated scenic viewpoints in the planning area, nor are there designated scenic resources for which the City requires view protection. All future projects within the City will require submittal and approval of detailed plans and project-specific environmental review. The proposed project would also incorporate goals, policies, strategies, and recommendations intended to avoid, reduce, offset, or otherwise minimize potential adverse impacts to the overall visual character associated with new development followed by project approval. Therefore, project-related impacts on the visual character and/or quality of the planning area and its surroundings would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Create a new source of substantial light and glare that would affect day or nighttime views. While the proposed project itself would not result in direct sources of light or glare, future development facilitated by the proposed project would introduce new sources of light to the City that are typical of development projects. All building and landscape lighting would be consistent with the design standards established in the proposed UDE and the City's Municipal Code. On-site landscaping proposed as part of new development projects would reduce glare and would serve to screen light sources to reduce the visual impact of lighting from buildings and parking lots. Although future development would introduce new sources of light that would contribute to the light visible in the night sky and surrounding area, the City is highly urbanized and is currently characterized by significant nighttime lighting.

The proposed project envisions future development of buildings and structures with a variety of materials, which may include reflective materials. Each future development project would be subject to project-level CEQA review at the time such project is under consideration by the City. The City would review site plans and architectural renderings for the presence of reflective materials, assess potential impacts related to light and glare, and propose mitigation, if necessary. Therefore, impacts related to the creation of substantial light and/or glare would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in cumulative aesthetic impacts. Future development facilitated by the proposed project would change the visual character of the City, particularly within the Major Areas of Change, as compared to existing conditions. The site design, landscaping, and architectural design of future projects would be required to be consistent with goals, policies, strategies, and development standards established by the proposed UDE, which are intended to avoid, reduce, offset, or otherwise minimize identified potential adverse impacts of the proposed project or provide significant benefits to the community and/or to the physical environment. The proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare on the planning area as a result of future development projects facilitated by project approval. Uses permitted under the proposed PlaceTypes would introduce more lighting due to the higher building

densities/intensities as allowed by the proposed project. However, because the City is currently characterized as an urban environment with existing high levels of light pollution, light emitted by future development projects would not result in a cumulatively significant impact related to light and glare. No mitigation is required.

Air Quality

Impact: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Because the proposed project involves long-term growth, emissions of criteria pollutants associated with future development would occur. Future development would be required to comply with applicable efficiency standards and the proposed LUE/UDE goals and policies. Consequently, emissions generated by development projects in addition to existing sources within the City are not considered to cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin. Implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to an increase in frequency or severity of air quality violations and delay attainment of the ambient air quality standards (AAQS) or interim emission reductions in the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). No mitigation is required.

The proposed project is consistent with growth forecasts generated for the City by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). These growth projections are utilized by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) in developing their AQMP. The SCAQMD is currently in the process of approving and adopting the 2016, which accounts for SCAG's growth projections for the City through the year 2040. Therefore, because the proposed project is consistent with SCAG's growth projections through project build out in the year 2040, the proposed project would also be consistent with the AQMP. Based on the requirements for consistency with emission control strategies in the AQMP, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP and/or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact associated with conflicts with applicable air quality plans. No mitigation is required.

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

CO Hot-Spot Analysis. A carbon monoxide (CO) hot-spot analysis was conducted at four busy intersections in Los Angeles County during the peak morning and afternoon periods and did not predict a violation of CO standards. One of the top four worst-performing intersections in this analysis (i.e., Long Beach Boulevard/Imperial Highway) is located approximately 4 miles north of the planning area. Since the SCAQMD-modeled intersections do not exceed the CO standards, all intersections within the project study area with a lesser volume of traffic and under less extreme conditions would not exceed the CO standards. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not be expected to result in CO hot spots, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in a cumulatively considerable contribution net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Emissions associated with the build out of the proposed project may exceed the daily SCAQMD thresholds for volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in size (PM₁₀), and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size (PM_{2.5}). However, in a cumulative context, emissions would be lower because of the stringent United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and California vehicle emissions standards aimed at reducing vehicle emissions that would be phased in over the life of the project. Implementation of the proposed LUE/UDE policies would also help reduce air pollutant emissions by promoting walking, bicycling, and use of public transit that would contribute to reduced VMT. Further, the City's Air Quality

and Mobility Elements also encourage alternative fueling facilities and modes of transportation and Transportation Demand Management. Therefore, emissions of criteria pollutants associated with future development under the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable significant impact associated with emissions of PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and ozone (O₃) precursors (VOCs, NO_x, and CO) under the California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS). Future development would also be required to demonstrate compliance with the AQMP, the SIP, California Air Resources Board (ARB) motor vehicle standards, SCAQMD regulations for stationary sources and architectural coatings, Title 24 energy efficiency standards, and the proposed LUE/UDE goals and policies. Therefore, cumulative air quality impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. While odor sources are present within the City, the odor policies enforced by the SCAQMD and the City prohibit nuisance odors and identify enforcement measures to reduce odor impacts to nearby receptors. Construction and operation of land uses consistent with the proposed project that would have the potential to result in nuisance odors would be required to comply with these regulations. Therefore, impacts associated with objectionable odors would be less than significant.

Impact: Result in cumulative air quality impacts. Future development that may occur with implementation of the project would contribute criteria pollutants to the area during project construction and operation. However, future development under the proposed project would be required to comply with ARB, SCAQMD, and Title 24 regulations and standards and the proposed LUE/UDE project goals and policies. Consequently, emissions generated by development projects in addition to existing sources within the City would not cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin. Implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to an increase in frequency or severity of air quality violations and delay attainment of the AAQS or interim emission reductions in the AQMP. No mitigation is required.

Global Climate Change (Greenhouse Gas Emissions)

Impact: Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. In addition to the City's Sustainable City Action Plan (SCAP), the ARB Scoping Plan and the SCAG 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP)/(SCS) identify strategies to reduce GHG emissions, both of which are applicable to the proposed project. The proposed project and its policies would be consistent with applicable measures and goals identified in the City's SCAP, the ARB Scoping Plan, and SCAG's 2012 RTP/SCS. Furthermore, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with or impede implementation of reduction goals identified in Assembly Bill (AB) 32, Executive Order (EO) S-3-05, or other strategies to help reduce GHGs to the level proposed by the Governor. The project would also be subject to all applicable regulatory requirements, which would also reduce the GHG emissions of the project. Further, the proposed project would result in a net reduction of overall GHG emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, program, policy, or regulation related to the reduction of GHG emissions. Impacts are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in cumulative global climate change/greenhouse gas emission impacts. The proposed project would result in a GHG emission profile that is lower than existing GHG emissions within the City. Additionally, since climate change is a global issue, it is unlikely that the proposed project would generate enough GHG emissions to influence global climate change (GCC) on its own. Because the proposed project's impacts alone would not cause or significantly contribute to GCC, project-related carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_{2e}) emissions and their contribution to GCC impacts in the State of California would not make a significant contribution to cumulatively considerable GHG emission

impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant long-term cumulative impact on GCC (including sea level rise). Rising sea levels may affect the built environment, including coastal development such as buildings, roads, and infrastructure. However, future projects facilitated under the proposed project would be planned in consideration of the conditions at the time they are proposed and would be evaluated for their potential to be affected by the change in sea level resulting from GCC during environmental review. Impacts are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Land Use

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

General Plan: The proposed project would replace the existing land use designations with the proposed 14 PlaceTypes. Although PlaceTypes are currently inconsistent with the existing General Plan land use designations, approval of the proposed project would result in the project being consistent with the General Plan and would ensure the proposed LUE would be the presiding policy document guiding land use in the City of Long Beach. The goals and policies in the General Plan would be updated and replaced by the goals, strategies, policies, and implementation strategies outlined in the proposed LUE and UDE. These goals, strategies, policies, and implementation strategies would be internally consistent between the proposed LUE and UDE, as well as consistent with existing elements of the City's General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to potential conflicts with the City's General Plan. No mitigation is required.

City Zoning Code: While the PlaceTypes included as part of the project would be inconsistent with some current zoning districts and regulations outlined in the City's existing Zoning Code and corresponding Zoning Map, the project includes Project Design Feature 4.4.1 to address such inconsistencies. Project Design Feature 4.4.1 requires the implementation of a Zone Change Program to ensure that land use changes facilitated by the proposed LUE are consistent with the Zoning Code. Therefore, with incorporation of Project Design Feature 4.4.1, the proposed project would be consistent with the City's Zoning Code and Zoning Map. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to potential conflicts with the City's Zoning Code. No mitigation is required.

Local Coastal Program: Because the proposed project would result in updates to the City's General Plan that would be inconsistent with portions of the City's existing Local Coastal Program (LCP), project implementation could result in potential land use conflicts with the LCP. Therefore, updates/amendments to the City's LCP could be required at the time individual applications for development within the City's Coastal Zone are proposed, if they were determined by the City to be inconsistent with the City's LCP. Approval of these future LCP amendments would reduce potential inconsistencies with the City's LCP to a less than significant level. No mitigation is required.

SCAG RCP and RTP/SCS: The proposed project would be consistent with both the Regional Comprehensive Plan's (RCP) and RTP/SCS's goals of locating new development adjacent to High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs), improving the transportation network, providing a variety of new housing types, promoting a diverse economy, and protecting the existing natural environment. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to potential conflicts with the SCAG's RCP and RTP/SCS. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in cumulative land use impacts. New development projects facilitated by project approval would be subject to separate General Plan consistency analyses and would be reviewed for

consistency with adopted land use plans and policies. In addition, approval of the proposed project would ensure that the proposed LUE would become the guiding land use document for the City, thereby mitigating any potential inconsistencies with the City's General Plan and other applicable land use documents (i.e., the California Coastal Act, the City's LCP, and SCAG's RCP and RTP/SCS). The project would also address potential inconsistencies with the City's Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map within the first 5 years following project approval (as outlined in Project Design Feature 4.4.1), which would reduce cumulative project impacts related to potential zoning inconsistencies to a less than significant level. No mitigation is required.

Noise

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

Short-Term Construction-Related Noise. Two-types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction of potential development allowed by the LUE. First, construction crew commutes and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the site for future projects would incrementally increase noise levels on access roads leading to the sites. Although there would be the relatively high single-event noise exposure potential causing intermittent noise nuisance, the effect on longer-term (hourly or daily) ambient noise levels would be small. The second type of short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during demolition, site preparation, excavation, grading, and building erection on the future project sites. The maximum noise level generated by each scraper on future project sites would be approximately 87 dBA maximum instantaneous noise level (L_{max}) at 50 feet from the scraper. Assuming that each piece of construction equipment operates at some distance from other equipment, the worst-case combined noise level during this phase of future construction would be 91 dBA L_{max} at a distance of 50 feet from the active construction area. Construction activities associated with development allowed under the LUE would be subject to compliance with the City Noise Ordinance to ensure that noise impacts from construction sources are reduced to a less than significant level. No mitigation is required.

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

Implementation of the LUE is not anticipated to result in increased railroad operations within the City. However, the LUE proposes the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType, which would allow future multifamily developments to be located along the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Blue Line fixed-rail route. Locating multifamily developments near the light-rail corridor could expose sensitive land uses to operational rail noise. However, several of the LUE and UDE policies require new development projects to incorporate site planning and project design strategies to separate or buffer neighborhoods from incompatible activities or land uses. Therefore, implementation of the LUE/UDE would not expose persons to noise levels in excess of the City's Municipal Code. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Expose persons to or generate excess groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. Ground-borne noise and vibration from construction activity would be mostly low to moderate except if pavement breaking or sheet-pile vibration is used on a site. Receptors at 100 feet and 200 feet from the construction activity may be exposed to ground-borne vibration up to 86 vibration velocity decibels (VdB) and 80 VdB, respectively. Construction of future projects associated with implementation of the

LUE/UDE could result in the generation of ground-borne vibration. However, Chapter 8.80 of the City's Noise Ordinance limits the operation of any device that creates vibration above the vibration perception threshold of 67 VdB. Any construction activities associated with implementation of the LUE/UDE would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance requirements. Therefore, impacts from typical construction methods would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive ground-borne vibration or noise levels. No mitigation is required.

Potential ground-borne vibration and noise impacts may also occur from rail activity because the proposed project would include the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType along the Metro Blue Line. To ensure new land uses adjacent to the rail line are not exposed to excessive ground-borne vibration, LU Policy 15-6 requires that new development within 200 feet of the Metro rail line conduct a vibration assessment demonstrating that Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Ground-borne Vibration Impact Criteria for the proposed land use are not exceeded. If necessary, the vibration assessment shall also demonstrate project modifications required to ensure criteria compliance. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to excessive ground-borne vibration and/or ground-borne noise levels. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Traffic volumes on some streets within the City would increase due to the growth envisioned under the project, which is expected to result in greater traffic noise levels compared to existing conditions. However, the anticipated increase in traffic volumes associated with the proposed project would be less than the doubling of existing traffic, resulting in a noise increase of less than 3 dBA; therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to result in the generation of substantial traffic noise increases. Implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts with respect to a permanent increase in ambient noise levels. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels. Maximum combined noise levels from proposed project-related construction activities could reach up to 91 dBA L_{max} at 50 feet for limited times during future construction. Construction noise is permitted by the City's Municipal Code when activities occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction would be permitted on Sundays. Construction activities associated with development allowed under the LUE would be subject to compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance to ensure that noise impacts from construction sources are reduced to a less than significant level. No mitigation is required.

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

Population and Housing

Impact: Induce substantial population growth. The proposed project would allow for the increased intensity and density of mixed-use and residential uses in the City that would facilitate the future development of up to 11,744 new housing units through the year 2040. This growth would be consistent with SCAG's regional growth forecasts for the same horizon year. Therefore, the project's growth-inducing potential would be less than significant, as it would not foster growth in excess of what is

assumed in pertinent master plans, land use plans, or in projections made by regional planning agencies (e.g., SCAG).

While the place of residence of the persons accepting employment provided by the proposed uses is uncertain, due to the City's projected jobs-to-housing ratio, it is reasonable that a large percentage of these jobs would be filled by persons already living within the City or project area; therefore, no significant increase in population of the City is anticipated to result from the development or operation of future development facilitated by the proposed project. Improvements to public utilities, including new water, sanitary sewer, and storm water services would be identified on a project-specific basis as new developments are proposed under the proposed LUE. Infrastructure improvements associated with future development facilitated by project approval would be sized appropriately for each project and would not be oversized to serve additional growth beyond that envisioned under the proposed LUE. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the inducement of substantial population growth. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in cumulative population and housing impacts. The City's population is anticipated to increase by 18,230 persons by 2040. Similarly, the City's employment is anticipated to increase by 28,511 jobs by 2040 and the County's employment is anticipated to increase by 5,213,136 jobs by 2040. Project-related increases in population and employment have been accounted for in SCAG's growth projections for the City. The proposed project will serve an existing demand for employment, while also meeting the cumulative demand of employment that will result from the City's projected future population. These increases for population, housing, and employment would be within the total projected growth forecasts for 2040. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively significant population or housing impact and the future development facilitated by project approval would not significantly induce growth in areas where growth was not previously anticipated. No mitigation is required.

Public Services

Impact: Result in substantial impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection. The proposed project does not include any physical improvements, but allows future development that is anticipated to create an increase in the typical range of fire protection service calls within the City. The costs of additional personnel and materials are anticipated to be offset through the increased revenues and fees, such as property taxes, generated by future development. Future projects would be reviewed by the City on a project-by-project basis and would need to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted. Prior to the issuance of building permits, future project applicants would be required to pay the adopted police facilities impact fees. The LBFD would also continue to be supported by Proposition H revenue; the City's General Funds; the City's Tidelands operation revenue; and other revenue sources. Therefore, sufficient revenue would be available for necessary improvements to provide for adequate fire facilities, equipment, and personnel upon build out of the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in substantial impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection. The proposed project does not include any physical improvements, but allows future development that is anticipated to create an increase in the typical range of police service calls within the City. To serve future growth, new and/or additional police resources would be needed to prevent an impact to service ratios. The costs of additional personnel and materials are anticipated to be offset through the increased revenues and fees, such as property taxes, generated by

future development. Future projects would be reviewed by the City on a project-by-project basis and would need to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted. Prior to the issuance of building permits, future project applicants would be required to pay the adopted police facilities impact fees. In addition, the LBPD would continue to be supported by Proposition H revenue, a per barrel tax on all oil producers in Long Beach; the City's Tidelands operation revenue; and other revenue sources. Therefore, sufficient revenue would be available for necessary improvements to provide for adequate police facilities, equipment, and personnel upon build out of the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in substantial impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for public schools. Implementation of the proposed project would allow future development that would enable the generation of school-age children within the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) service area. With General Plan build out, elementary and middle school enrollment in LBUSD would continue to be within the capacity of the 2014–2015 LBUSD facilities, but high school and total estimated enrollment in LBUSD in 2040 would exceed the capacity of the existing LBUSD facilities. Future development projects in the City would also be required to pay school impact development fees to LBUSD for the operation, maintenance, and development of schools to accommodate future student enrollment. The proposed project does not include any physical improvements; therefore, future school facility needs would be funded by fees collected by future development projects. Further, all future projects consistent with the proposed project would be required to undergo project-specific environmental review and comply with the provision of school developer fees or new/altered facilities. Therefore, project-related impacts related to public schools would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

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

Public Libraries. The proposed project does not include any physical improvements, but would allow for new PlaceTypes that would facilitate an increase in housing units and demand for Long Beach Public Library (LBPL) facilities. The City has not formally adopted a service standard of library space per capita, but the City did establish a target of 0.45 square feet (sf) per capita in its budget for Fiscal Year 2007. In total, the existing LBPL system has approximately 220,265 sf of library facilities, which is adequate to serve the City's existing population and sufficiently support the projected demand generated by the build out of the proposed project. Additionally, the North Branch Library is scheduled to move to a new, larger facility, which will increase the LBPL square footage by approximately 17,700 sf. Therefore, the proposed project's increase in demand on library services can be served by the existing facilities and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Electricity. Future growth occurring under the proposed project would generate electricity demand of approximately 1,827.71 gigawatt hours (GWh) in the General Plan build-out year of 2040. As such, the project-related increase in electricity demand would be approximately 11 percent greater than the existing electricity demand and approximately 1 percent of the 2040 peak demand. Therefore, it is anticipated that build out of the General Plan would be within the forecasted electricity demand for 2040 build out. The projected electricity demand does not include the State's 50 percent increase in energy efficiency Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) for new residences and buildings nor does the analysis account for Title 24 building energy efficiency as a result of changes to the proposed 2017 CalGreen Building and Energy Efficiency Standards for new residences and buildings. New facilities

to support the project-related demand for electricity would be constructed in accordance with the demand for the new service. Because developments that would be considered under the proposed project have not yet been designed or proposed, the specific electricity facilities that would need to be installed to serve such future developments are unknown at this time, as are the potential environmental impacts of such installations. Potential environmental impacts would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. However, it is not anticipated that major new facilities would be necessary to serve new development facilitated by project approval at General Plan build out (2040). Furthermore, because the City is largely built out, the construction of new electrical substations is also not expected to be necessary. Therefore, growth in the demand for electricity is anticipated to be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Natural Gas. Future growth occurring under the proposed project would generate a natural gas demand of 13,303.22 million cubic feet (MMcf), or an approximately 33 percent increase in natural gas demand. The projected natural gas demand does not include the State's 50 percent increase in energy efficiency RPS for new residences and buildings and does not account for Title 24 building energy efficiency as a result of changes to the proposed 2017 CalGreen Building and Energy Efficiency Standards for new residences and buildings. Because developments that would be considered under the proposed project have not yet been designed or proposed, the specific improvements to existing natural gas facilities that need to be implemented to serve future developments are unknown at this time, as are the potential environmental impacts of such improvements. Potential environmental impacts would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. However, it is not anticipated that major improvements would be necessary to serve the City and new development facilitated by the project approval. Therefore, growth in demand for natural gas is anticipated to be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Result in cumulative public services impacts. The proposed project would contribute to cumulative local and regional demand for public services and utilities, including police and fire services, schools, parks, libraries, electricity, and natural gas. For each public service, the proposed project would generate increased demand in varying amounts. However, each future project within the project area would be evaluated individually, and project-specific mitigation would be required as needed. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to public facilities would be less than significant.

Fire Protection. The LBFD anticipates cumulative demand in order to plan for overall service. This cumulative demand is anticipated to be met through project implementation as the LUE establishes the development of future fire stations. Furthermore, through implementation of the proposed project, the City would reduce the potential for dangerous fires by concentrating development within urban areas where there is a low fire risk and by requiring that future projects comply with applicable City and State regulations related to fire. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to fire protection impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Police Protection. The LBPDP anticipates cumulative demand in order to plan for overall service. This cumulative demand is anticipated to be met through project implementation as the LUE establishes the development of future police stations. In addition, the need for additional law enforcement associated with cumulative growth would be addressed through the annual budgeting process when budget adjustments would be made in an effort to meet changes in service demand. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to police protection impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Public Schools. The proposed project would generate approximately 3,977 school-aged children, which would lead to an increased demand on existing educational school facilities. Future projects would be accounted for on a project-by-project basis. Residential projects located within the LBUSD service area, but outside the City, would have the potential to generate school-aged children, and, as a result, increase demand on educational school facilities. Future development projects in the City would also be required to pay school impact development fees to LBUSD for the operation, maintenance, and development of schools to accommodate future student enrollment. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative school impacts, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Public Libraries. The City currently meets the LBPL system's square footage requirements, and the proposed project would not exceed the LBPL system's ability to meet project demand at build out with existing library services. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to library impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Electricity. Buildout of the General Plan would result in an operational electricity demand of 1,827.71 GWh (an 11 percent increase in demand over 2012 conditions). The 2040 proposed project build out would represent approximately 1 percent of the extrapolated 2040 peak demand. Therefore, it is anticipated that build out of the General Plan would be within the forecasted electricity demand for 2040 build out.

Although the proposed project has the potential to increase electrical demand in the area, Southern California Edison (SCE) has identified adequate capacity to handle an increase in electrical demand, and any increase in electrical demand resulting from the proposed project would be incremental compared to an increase in regional electrical demand. Compliance with Title 24 of the California Administrative Code regulates energy consumption in new construction and regulates building energy consumption for heating, cooling, and lighting for future development under the proposed project. 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 cumulative impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Natural Gas. Build out of the General Plan (2040) would result in an operational natural gas demand of 13,303.22 MMcf. Therefore, the anticipated 2040 natural gas demands would exceed the City of Long Beach Gas & Oil Department's (LBGO) projected natural gas demand for the year 2035. While future development under the General Plan build-out (2040) scenario would exceed current projections for the year 2035, all future development under the proposed project 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. Furthermore, gas service would be added to the existing system by LBGO, as necessary, to meet the requirements of individual development projects in the City. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative natural gas impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Utilities

Impact: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements. The proposed project is anticipated to generate a total estimated wastewater flow of approximately 40.2 million gallons per day (mgd), or an approximate increase of 2.8 mgd over 2012 usage. There is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity within the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (LACSD) facilities to accommodate this increase in wastewater demand citywide, and no major improvements are required. The increase in wastewater flows associated

with the proposed project would not exceed the treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Future improvements and upgrades to existing sewer lines would continue to be prioritized on an as-needed basis, and development fees collected from future projects facilitated by project approval would fund the highest-priority projects. Therefore, impacts related to wastewater are less than significant. No mitigation is required.

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 anticipated 2040 water demand for the proposed project represents approximately 7 percent of the Long Beach Water Department's (LBWD) projected water supply for the year 2040. Therefore, the project-related increase in water demand would be within the LBWD's projected water supply for its service area in the year 2040. Additionally, under Assembly Bill (AB) 610, a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) would be required for projects meeting specific criteria. Individual projects occurring under the proposed project would be required to prepare a WSA if they meet any of the requirements under AB 610. Therefore, impacts related to water demand would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

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

The proposed project does not include physical improvements, but sanitary services during construction of future projects would likely be provided by portable toilet facilities, which transport waste off site for treatment and disposal. Therefore, during construction, potential impacts to wastewater treatment and wastewater conveyance infrastructure would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

No new major sewer upgrades are anticipated or recommended for the proposed project. All new development in the City will be subject to sewer capacity considerations as part of the City development review and approval process. Improvements and upgrades to sewer lines are prioritized based on need. Development fees from future projects occurring under the proposed project would be collected from each project and used to fund the highest priority improvements. The proposed project would not substantially or incrementally exceed the current or future scheduled capacity of the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) or the Long Beach Wastewater Reclamation Plant (WRP) by generating flows greater than those anticipated. Therefore, project impacts related to wastewater treatment would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Future development under the proposed project would be required to comply with the provisions of the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit), or any other subsequent applicable permits. The Construction General Permit requires preparation of a SWPPP to identify construction BMPs to be implemented during project construction in order to reduce impacts to water

quality, including those impacts associated with soil erosion, siltation, spills, and increased runoff. With compliance with the Construction General Permit, construction impacts related to the capacity of the existing storm water drainage systems would be reduced to less than significant levels. No mitigation is required.

Operation of future projects would increase impervious surface area, which would reduce infiltration. Future projects would be reviewed on a project-by-project basis and would need to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted. Depending on the size and nature of the projects, a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) would be developed on a project-specific basis to address post-construction urban runoff and storm water pollution from new development and significant redevelopment projects. The hydrological analyses included in the WQMPs prepared for future projects would identify BMPs and improvements to the existing storm drain system that would ensure that the City would be able to adequately handle increased storm water runoff as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the construction or expansion of storm water drainage facilities. No mitigation is required.

Impact: Insufficient permitted capacity at landfill. Construction of future projects facilitated by the proposed project would generate demolition waste. Construction waste would be recycled to the extent feasible pursuant to Chapter 18.67, Construction and Demolition Recycling Program, of the City's Municipal Code. Under the Municipal Code, covered projects requiring demolition or building permits issued on or after January 1, 2014, are required to divert at least 60 percent of all project-related construction and demolition material from landfills. Compliance with this chapter of the Municipal Code would consist of a condition of approval on any construction or demolition permit issued for a covered project. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to solid waste generation during construction. No mitigation is required.

The City's Environmental Services Bureau provides solid waste collection services to collect and dispose of the solid waste/refuse generated by the City. Solid waste generated in the City is also transported to LACSD facilities when solid waste is considered unprocessable to the Southeast Resource Recovery Facility (SERRF). Solid waste generated by operations associated with future development under the proposed project would be collected by the City's Environmental Services Bureau and hauled to the SERRF. With the proposed project, the City is forecast to generate approximately 1.6 million pounds of solid waste in 2040, or an increase of approximately 133,342 pounds (lbs) per day. There is sufficient landfill capacity in the region to serve solid waste generated by the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to solid waste generation are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

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

Wastewater. While the proposed project does not include physical improvements, the future build out of the proposed project is not anticipated to generate wastewater above LACSD's current capacity. The proposed project would result in a population consistent with the growth projections for the City provided in the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to wastewater generation in the LACSD service area would not be cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Water. According to the City's 2015 Regional Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California's (MWDSC) future water supplies are reliable, because the MWDSC's 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, the LBWD, which provides the groundwater supply to the City, projects that there are sufficient groundwater supplies to meet any future demand requirements in the City. Further, the current 2015 UWMP accounts for the proposed project's transition from traditional land uses to PlaceTypes and has demonstrated that the LBWD has the ability to serve the project-related increase in water demand through the year 2040.

The MWDSC's 2010 Regional UWMP describes its water availability and identifies future water supplies to meet the region's long-term water demand. The MWDSC has established the Water Supply Allocation Plan (WSAP), which calculates each member agency's supply allocations and key implementation elements required for administering the allocation. The WSAP also considers how the MWDSC would be able to provide water to its member agencies during a catastrophic interruption in water supplies. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to water demand would not be cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Solid Waste. Development associated with the proposed project and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within the County would contribute to an increase in demand for landfill capacity and solid waste services for the County. It is expected that the SERRF will continue to operate at its current permitted daily capacity through 2027. The SERRF currently does not exceed its daily maximum permitted disposal capacity. Solid waste considered unprocessable by SERRF would be taken to landfills in Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties. There is currently sufficient permitted capacity within the LACSD system serving Los Angeles County to provide adequate future capacity for the County's solid waste needs. The City currently complies with all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to solid waste would not be cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

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

Air Quality

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

Construction Emissions. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would occur over the build-out horizon of the project, which would cause short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants. For this broad-based analysis, it is not possible to determine whether the scale and phasing of future *individual* projects would exceed the SCAQMD's short-term regional or localized construction emissions thresholds. However, localized construction impacts of future projects could potentially exceed Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs), particularly for construction of planning areas larger than 5 acres or planning areas with more intense construction activities. To address this potential exceedance, regulatory

measures (e.g., SCAQMD Rule 201 for a permit to operate, Rule 403 for fugitive dust control, Rule 1113 for architectural coatings, Rule 1403 for new source review, and ARB's Airborne Toxic Control Measures) are currently in place, and mitigation imposed at the project level may include an extension of construction schedules and/or use of special equipment. Because the scale of construction activities has not been determined or estimated and in order to present the most conservative assumptions, the air quality impacts, which would be associated with future construction of individual projects that could occur with implementation of the proposed project, would be assumed to be potentially significant.

While existing City policies and regulations and proposed LUE/UDE goals and policies are intended to minimize impacts associated with nonattainment criteria pollutants, BMP measures are included as Standard Conditions imposed by the City (including Standard Condition AQ-1), and are identified to ensure that the intended environmental protections are achieved. Additionally, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 is identified requiring the preparation of project-specific technical assessments evaluating construction-related air quality impacts to further ensure that construction-related emissions are reduced to the maximum extent feasible for projects that require environmental evaluation under CEQA. With implementation of Standard Condition AQ-1 and Mitigation Measure AQ-1, the potential construction emissions impacts associated with future development facilitated by the proposed project would be less than significant.

Standard Condition:

SC AQ-1: To ensure compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) rules and provide Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction of future projects facilitated under the proposed project, the construction contractor shall implement the following BMPs during construction, where feasible, to further reduce emissions from these sources.

- Install temporary construction power supply meters on site and use this to provide power to electric power tools whenever feasible. If temporary electric power is available on site, forbid the use of portable gasoline- or diesel-fueled electric generators.
- Use of diesel oxidation catalysts and/or catalyzed diesel particulate traps on diesel equipment, as feasible.
- Maintain equipment according to manufacturers' specifications.
- Restrict idling of equipment and trucks to a maximum of 5 minutes (per California Air Resources Board [ARB] regulation).
- Phase grading operations to reduce disturbed areas and times of exposure.
- Avoid excavation and grading during wet weather.
- Limit on-site construction routes and stabilize construction entrance(s).
- Remove existing vegetation only when absolutely necessary.
- Sweep up spilled dry materials (e.g., cement, mortar, or dirt track-out) immediately. Never attempt to wash them away with water. Use only minimal water for dust control.
- Store stockpiled materials and wastes under a temporary roof or secured plastic sheeting or tarp.
- Properly dispose of all demolition wastes. Materials that can be recycled from demolition projects include: metal framing, wood, concrete, asphalt, and plate glass.

Unusable, un-recyclable debris should be confined to dumpsters, covered at night, and taken to a landfill for disposal.

- Hazardous debris such as asbestos must be handled in accordance with specific laws and regulations and disposed of as hazardous waste. For more information on asbestos handling and disposal regulations, contact the SCAQMD.

Mitigation Measure:

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

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

Finding: Both the standard condition and the mitigation measure are feasible and would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to the violation of air quality standards and contribution of air quality emissions during project construction to a less than significant level for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR.

Impact: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Criteria Pollutants. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would occur over the build-out horizon of the project, which would cause short-term emissions of criteria pollutants. However,

emissions of criteria pollutants associated with future development under the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact associated with the emissions of PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and ozone (O₃) precursors (VOCs, NO_x, and CO) under the California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS). While existing City policies and regulations and the proposed LUE/UDE goals and policies are intended to minimize impacts associated with nonattainment criteria pollutants, BMPs are included as Standard Condition AQ-1 and are intended to ensure environmental protections are achieved. Additionally, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 requires the preparation of project-specific technical assessments evaluating construction-related air quality impacts to further ensure construction emissions are reduced to the maximum extent feasible. With implementation of Standard Condition AQ-1 and Mitigation Measure AQ-1, the potential emissions impact associated with the construction of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Operation of new land uses consistent with the project's proposed land use plan would generate fewer criteria air pollutants in the City from area/stationary sources and mobile sources. Therefore, the cumulative air quality impact associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

Standard Condition:

SC AQ-1: To ensure compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) rules and provide Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction of future projects facilitated under the proposed project, the construction contractor shall implement the following BMPs during construction, where feasible, to further reduce emissions from these sources.

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

Mitigation Measure:

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

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

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

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

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

Air Quality

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

Operational Emissions. Because the scale of operational activities has not been determined or estimated, and in order to present the most conservative assumptions, air quality impacts associated with future operation of individual projects under the proposed project are assumed to be potentially significant. Mitigation Measure AQ-2 requires the preparation of project-specific technical assessments evaluating operational-related air quality impacts to further ensure that operational-related emissions are reduced to the maximum extent feasible for projects that require environmental evaluation under CEQA. Unlike construction activities where the extension of construction schedules and/or use of special equipment can be reasonably assumed to be implemented, operational characteristics and the associated emissions cannot be determined at the time of this analysis. Therefore, despite implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2, and in an abundance of caution, the potential emissions impact associated with the operation of the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure:

MM AQ-2: Prior to future discretionary project approval, development project applicants shall prepare and submit to the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with SCAQMD methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the Department of Development Services shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the Standard Conditions of Approval. Below are possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions:

- For site-specific development that requires refrigerated vehicles, the construction documents shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical service connections at loading docks for plugging in the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions.
- Applicants for manufacturing and light industrial uses shall consider energy storage and combined heat and power in appropriate applications to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use.
- Site-specific developments with truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with California Air Resources Board (ARB) Rule 2845 (13 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Chapter 10, Section 2485).

Site-specific development shall demonstrate that an adequate number of electrical vehicle Level 2 charging stations are provided on site. The location of the electrical outlets shall be specified on building plans, and proper installation shall be verified by the Department of Development Services prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Finding: Mitigation is feasible and substantially lessens the significant operational air quality impacts of the proposed project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2 would minimize operational emissions generated during project operation; however, even with implementation of the mitigation measure, potential operational emissions would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Toxic Air Contaminants Emissions. As previously stated, despite implementation of Mitigation

Measure AQ-2, the potential emissions impacts, including those associated with TACs associated with the operation of the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable.

Various industrial and commercial processes allowed under the proposed project would release toxic air contaminants (TACs). Emissions of TACs would be controlled through permitting issued by the SCAQMD and would be subject to further study and health risk assessment prior to the issuance of any necessary air quality permits under SCAQMD Rule 1401. Since it is not possible to determine the amount of TAC concentrations at the time of this analysis, it is not possible to calculate the risks for a particular health effect within the proposed Areas of Change. The proposed project is a programmatic project and until specific future projects are proposed, the associated TAC emissions cannot be determined or modeled at this time. Future development projects would be subject to environmental review under CEQA and would be required to analyze potential TAC emissions and include mitigation as appropriate.

In addition to stationary/area sources of TACs, commercial and industrial operations could generate a substantial amount of diesel particulate matter emissions from off-road equipment use and truck idling. Land development projects are required to comply with AB 2588, SCAQMD Rule 1401, and ARB standards for diesel engines. As stated above, until specific future projects are proposed, the associated emissions cannot be determined or modeled at this time. Future projects would be subject to environmental review under CEQA and would be required to analyze potential emissions and include mitigation as appropriate.

If new sensitive receptors were sited within 500 feet of Interstate 710 or Interstate 405 (both of which emit TACs) or within the ARB's minimum siting recommendations of other stationary sources, they may be exposed to significant concentrations of air pollutants.

Goals and policies are included in the proposed LUE/UDE that would reduce concentrations of criteria air pollutant emissions and air toxics generated by construction and operation of new developments on nearby residences. Review of projects by SCAQMD for permitted sources of air toxics would ensure that health risks are minimized.

The Neo-Industrial PlaceType would also be used as a buffer between existing industrial and residential neighborhoods. No heavy industrial, warehousing, and distribution facilities are permitted in this land use category, and as such, industrial uses within this PlaceType would likely be below-average truck trip generators. Thus, no future projects would generate the level of truck trips expected for heavy industrial and/or warehouses. However, since it is not possible to determine the amount of TAC concentrations at the time of this analysis, it is not possible to calculate the risks for a particular health effect within the proposed Areas of Change.

The amount of emissions from a project does not necessarily correspond to the concentrations of air pollutants. Because the scale of operational activities has not been determined or estimated and in order to present conservative assumptions, the TAC health risk impacts associated with future operation of individual projects that may occur with implementation of the proposed project are assumed to be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure AQ-3 has been identified to ensure that mobile sources of TACs not covered under SCAQMD permits are considered during subsequent project-level environmental review. Mitigation Measure AQ-3 requires the preparation of project-specific technical health risk assessments evaluating operational-related health risk impacts to further ensure that operational-related emissions are reduced to the maximum extent feasible for projects that require environmental evaluation under CEQA. However, unlike construction activities for which the extension of construction schedules and/or use of special equipment

can be reasonably assumed to be implemented, operational characteristics and the associated emissions cannot be determined at the time of this analysis. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-3, the potential TAC health risk impact associated with the operation of the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

AQ-2: Prior to future discretionary project approval, development project applicants shall prepare and submit to the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with SCAQMD methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the Department of Development Services shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the Standard Conditions of Approval. Below are possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions:

- For site-specific development that requires refrigerated vehicles, the construction documents shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical service connections at loading docks for plugging in the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions.
- Applicants for manufacturing and light industrial uses shall consider energy storage and combined heat and power in appropriate applications to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use.
- Site-specific developments with truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with California Air Resources Board (ARB) Rule 2845 (13 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Chapter 10, Section 2485).

Site-specific development shall demonstrate that an adequate number of electrical vehicle Level 2 charging stations are provided on site. The location of the electrical outlets shall be specified on building plans, and proper installation shall be verified by the Department of Development Services prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

AQ-3: Prior to future discretionary approval for projects that require environmental evaluation under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Long Beach would evaluate new development proposals for sensitive land uses (e.g., residences, schools, and daycare centers) within the City for potential incompatibilities with regard to the ARB's *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* (April 2005). In addition, applicants for siting or expanding sensitive land uses that are within the recommended buffer distances listed in Table 1-1 of the CARB Handbook would submit a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to the City of Long Beach. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with the policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk and/or non-cancer hazard index exceeds the respective thresholds, as established by the SCAQMD at the time a project is considered, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that

mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below the aforementioned thresholds as established by the SCAQMD), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Air intakes oriented away from high-volume roadways and/or truck loading zones; and.
- Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the buildings provided with appropriately sized maximum efficiency rating value filters.

Prior to future discretionary project approval, applicants for new industrial or warehousing land uses that (1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered transport refrigeration units, and (2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, or nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit an HRA to the Department of Development Services. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State OEHHA and the SCAQMD. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk and/or non-cancer hazard index exceeds the respective thresholds, as established by the SCAQMD at the time a project is considered, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate whether best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms, are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level. T-BACTs may include, but are not limited to, restricting idling on site or electrifying warehousing docks to reduce diesel particulate matter, or requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. T-BACTs identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.

Finding: Mitigation measures are feasible and substantially lessen the emissions of TACs and their associated impacts on sensitive receptors. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2 and AQ-3 would minimize emissions of TAC; however, even with implementation of these mitigation measures, potential TAC emissions and their respective potential impact on sensitive receptors would remain significant and unavoidable.

Global Climate Change (Greenhouse Gases)

Impact: Generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. Implementation of the proposed project would contribute to global climate change (GCC) through direct and indirect emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) from land uses within the City. On a per capita basis, build out of the proposed project would reduce the GHG emissions from 9.5 metric tons (MT) of CO₂e per year per service population (MT of CO₂e/yr/SP) under existing conditions down to 5.9 MT of CO₂e/yr/SP (with reduction measures incorporated). However, the project's GHG emissions in the City for build-out year 2040 (5.9 MT of CO₂e/yr/SP) would still exceed the interim efficiency threshold of 3.4 MT of CO₂e/yr/SP.

While the proposed project includes various policies that would contribute to reduced GHG emissions, the City would require assistance from additional federal and State programs and regulations to achieve the long-term GHG emissions goal. Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through GHG-4 have been proposed to minimize and reduce potentially significant GHG impacts. In addition to the proposed mitigation

measures, additional statewide measures would be necessary to reduce GHG emissions from development that may occur with adoption of the proposed project to meet the long-term GHG reduction goals under Executive Orders (EOs) O S-3-05 and B-30-15. However, since no additional statewide measures are currently available that can be implemented, GHG emission impacts for the project under the build-out scenario would remain significant and unavoidable.

GHG-1: The City of Long Beach (City) shall develop a greenhouse gas (GHG) Reduction Plan or Climate Action Plan (CAP) to ensure that the City continues on a trajectory that aligns with the short-term, interim, and long-term state GHG reduction goals of Assembly Bill (AB) 32 (2020 goal), Executive Order (EO) B-30-15 (2030 goal), and EO S-03-05 (2050 goal). Within approximately 36 months of adoption of the proposed General Plan Land Use Element (LUE)/Urban Design Element (UDE) project, the City of Long Beach shall prepare and present to the City Council for adoption a community climate action plan/greenhouse gas reduction plan (Plan). The Plan shall identify strategies to be implemented to reduce GHG emissions associated with the City, and shall include as one alternative a program that achieves the AB 32 targets. In addition, the City shall monitor GHG emissions by updating its community-wide GHG emissions inventory every 5 years upon adoption of the initial Plan. Upon the next update to the Plan, the inventory, GHG reduction measures, and GHG reductions shall be forecast to year 2040 to ensure progress toward achieving the interim target that aligns with the long-term GHG reduction goals of EO S-03-04. The Plan update shall take into account the reductions achievable from federal and State actions and measures as well as ongoing work by the City and the private sector. The 2040 Plan update shall be completed by January 1, 2020, with a plan to achieve GHG reductions for 2030 (EO B-30-15 goal), provided the State has an actual plan to achieve reductions for 2030. New reduction programs in similar sectors as the proposed Plan (building energy, transportation, waste, water, wastewater, agriculture, and others) will likely be necessary. Future targets shall be considered in alignment with State reduction targets, to the maximum extent feasible, but it is premature at this time to determine whether or not such targets can be feasibly met through the combination of federal, state, and local action given technical, logistical and financial constraints. Future updates to the Plan shall account for the horizon beyond 2030 as the State adopts actual plans to meet post-2030 targets. The Plan will include details on how the reduction programs will be implemented and will designate responsible parties to monitor progress and ensure implementation of the reductions within the Plan. A monitoring and reporting program will be included to ensure the Plan achieves the reduction targets. The Plan will also include criteria that would trigger an update to the Plan. Examples of triggers requiring a Plan update include monitoring of progress that demonstrates that the Plan will not achieve the reduction targets, or economic and/or population growth that exceeds the scope of the Plan. In all instances, the Plan and any updates shall be consistent with State and federal law.

Long Beach GHG Reduction Plan or Climate Action Plan Measures:

- Establish a goal to encourage 15 percent of existing single-family homes to install solar installations before 2020.
- Establish a goal to encourage 15 percent of existing commercial/industrial buildings to install solar installations before 2020.
- Collaborate with Long Beach Transit to implement “Smart Bus” technology, global positioning system (GPS), and electronic displays at all transit stops by 2020 to provide customers with “real-time” arrival and departure time information.

- Explore the opportunity for expansion of electric- vehicle infrastructure, including requiring electric- vehicle charging stations in new qualified developments.
- Develop public education materials that support and encourage the use of recycled water.
- Consider a plan for installing recycled water infrastructures for all new parks, schools, and other public facilities to use 100 percent recycled water for non-potable outdoor uses.
- Adopt a municipal goal of 100 percent recycled water for non-potable sources, as feasible, depending on available recycled water infrastructure.
- Adopt a landscaping water conservation ordinance that exceeds the requirements in the Model Landscape Ordinance (AB 1881).

Post-2020 Measures:

- Prior to January 1, 2020, the City of Long Beach shall update the GHG Reduction Plan or CAP to address the GHG reduction goals of EO B-30-15 for GHG sectors for which the City has direct or indirect jurisdictional control. The City shall identify a GHG emissions reduction target for year 2030 that is consistent with the GHG reduction goals identified in EO S-03-05. The GHG Reduction Plan or CAP shall be updated to include measures to ensure that the City is on a trajectory that aligns with the State's 2030 GHG emissions reduction target.

GHG-2:

Within approximately 18 months of adoption of the proposed General Plan LUE/UDE project, the City shall prepare and present to the City Council for adoption a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction plan to ensure that GHG reduction can be achieved by reducing VMT and by increasing or encouraging the use of alternative fuels and transportation technologies.

- The City will ensure that new development incorporate both local and regional transit measures into the project design that promote the use of alternative modes of transportation.
- The City shall give priority to transportation projects that will contribute to a reduction in VMT per capita, while maintaining economic vitality and sustainability.
- The City will create an interconnected transportation system that allows a shift in travel from private passenger vehicle to alternative modes, including public transit, ride sharing, car sharing, bicycling, and walking.

GHG-3:

Prior to issuance of building permits for residential development projects within the LUE/UDE Areas of Change, the property owner/developer shall indicate on the building plans that the following features have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Long Beach Building and Safety Bureau prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

- For multifamily dwellings, electric vehicle charging shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code).
- Bicycle parking shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.9 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.

GHG-4: Prior to issuance of building permits for non-residential development projects within the LUE/UDE Areas of Change, the property owner/developer shall indicate on the building plans that the following features have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Long Beach Building and Safety Bureau prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

- For buildings with more than ten tenant-occupants, changing/shower facilities shall be provided as specified in Section A5.106.4.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.
- Preferential parking for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles shall be provided as specified in Section A5.106.5.1 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.

Facilities shall be installed to support future electric vehicle charging at each non-residential building with 30 or more parking spaces. Installation shall be consistent with Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.

Finding: Mitigation measures are feasible and substantially lessen the project's GHG emissions and GCC impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through GHG-4 would minimize GHG emissions of the project; however, even with implementation of these mitigation measures, potential GHG emissions would remain significant and unavoidable.

Transportation/Traffic

Impact: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit. The proposed project concentrates growth along corridors and districts that would provide residents and employees with alternatives for travel aside from a private automobile. However, concentrating future growth in these areas also has the potential to concentrate new automobile trips. Based on the City's criteria, 44 intersections could be significantly impacted by new development occurring under the proposed project. The forecasted intersection level of service (LOS) deficiencies are caused by future traffic volume growth from the projected project-related traffic volumes in the build-out year of 2040. Mitigation in the form of vehicle and non-vehicle capacity enhancements for each impacted intersection was reviewed for feasibility. It was determined that vehicle capacity enhancements would be infeasible because the effect of these measures cannot be guaranteed because they rely on the changing attitudes and actions of commuters. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at all 44 impacted intersections.

Executing implementation measures from the Mobility Element would have an effect on managing travel demand, reducing the volume of vehicle traffic, decreasing the volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio at City intersections, and improving vehicle LOS. Although these measures would contribute to a reduced vehicle LOS, their effects cannot be quantified and they cannot be considered mitigation for the 44 impacted study area intersections for the purposes of CEQA analysis in the Final EIR. Because vehicle capacity enhancements to the impacted intersections are not feasible, and because no other mitigation to reduce traffic is available and enforceable, impacts to the 44 intersections identified above are considered significant and unavoidable for the build-out year of 2040.

Finding: Mitigation measures are not feasible, and no other mitigation is available and enforceable to reduce the project's traffic impacts at 44 study area intersections. Therefore, project-related traffic impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact: Exceed a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. A significant impact at a Congestion Management Plan (CMP) intersection occurs when a project causes a 0.02 or greater increase in v/c ratio at an intersection operating at LOS E or F. Of the 88 study area intersections, the CMP includes 10 monitored intersections. Five intersections would have a significant project-related impact based on CMP criteria. It was determined that vehicle capacity enhancements would be infeasible to reduce impacts at these intersections because the effect of these measures cannot be guaranteed because they rely on the changing attitudes and actions of commuters. Because there is no feasible mitigation to reduce impacts at these impacted intersections, impacts at these five intersections are considered significant and unavoidable for the build-out year of 2040.

Finding: Mitigation measures are not feasible, and no other mitigation is available and enforceable to reduce project impacts on the five impacted CMP intersections. Therefore, project-related traffic impacts on CMP intersections would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact: Result in cumulative traffic impacts. The proposed project is a citywide policy action that would facilitate future development throughout the entire City, and the proposed project itself is cumulative in nature. Under 2040 Plus Project build-out conditions, 44 intersections would be significantly impacted and would operate below the City's LOS D standard. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to a cumulative impact at these 44 intersections. As previously stated, intersection enhancements at the impacted intersections were reviewed but determined to be infeasible. Implementation measures identified in the Mobility Element were designed to reduce the number of automobile trips on the roadway network and promote mobility by supporting all travel modes, but the effects of these measures on individual intersection LOS cannot be guaranteed because they rely on the changing attitudes and actions of commuters. Because physical vehicle capacity enhancements are not feasible, the impacts to the 44 intersections identified above are considered cumulatively significant and unavoidable for the build-out year of 2040.

Finding: Mitigation measures are not feasible and no other mitigation is available and enforceable to reduce cumulative project impacts with respect to traffic. Therefore, cumulative traffic impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

III. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

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

The Final EIR identified four alternatives as follows:

- Alternative 1: No Project/No Development
- Alternative 2: Areas of Change Reduction/Reduced Project Alternative
- Alternative 3: Reduced VMT Alternative/Transit-Oriented Alternative
- Alternative 4: Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative

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

Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative

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

Environmental Effects: The following impact determinations are made after the consideration of General Plan build out consistent with the existing adopted LUE and SRE. Under the No Project Alternative, the visual setting of the planning area would remain as guided by the development standards currently adopted under the existing LUE, SRE, Municipal Code, and/or Specific Plans. No additional air pollutant emissions or GHG emissions would be generated by new vehicle trips or short-term construction beyond development consistent with the existing General Plan. The existing land uses would continue to be consistent with the City's General Plan and zoning documents, and no General Plan Update/Amendment, LCP Amendment, or Zoning Amendment would be required. No additional short-term construction noise impacts or long-term operational noise impacts would occur to the surrounding area other than those effects already considered under the adopted General Plan. No additional population over the adopted projections for the General Plan would result from the continued existing uses and conditions in the planning area. No additional demands for fire or police services, other than those effects already considered to occur under the adopted General Plan, would occur, and no additional or increased demand for recreational facilities beyond those of the adopted General Plan would result for the No Project Alternative. Further, no additional vehicle trips would be generated by construction or operations in the planning area, no new sources of solid waste would be created, and no increase in demand for electricity or natural gas would occur beyond demand accounted for under projects consistent with the adopted General Plan.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: The No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the 17 Project Objectives. Without the proposed project, future development in the planning area would not be required to be consistent with the proposed LUE and UDE. The No Project Alternative would not help the City achieve its goal of creating great places through the establishment of new PlaceTypes and urban design principles not currently provided in the City's General Plan. Furthermore, this alternative would not include the provision for new housing and employment opportunities to accommodate future growth projections for the City nor would it expand the economic base of the City.

Findings: On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve the Project Objectives at all or to the same degree as the proposed project. In light of these considerations, the No Project/No Development Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed project and has been rejected from further consideration.

Facts in Support of the Finding: Because this alternative would not result in land use changes associated with the proposed project, it would reduce potentially significant air quality, GHG emissions, and traffic impacts. However, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not satisfy a majority of the Project Objectives nor would it realize the project benefits of accommodating projected increases in population; providing additional community services; diversifying the local economy; encouraging sustainable development practices; retaining the character and quality of existing neighborhoods in the City; and providing additional options for housing and mobility. On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve any of the Project Objectives. In light of these considerations, this alternative has been rejected in favor of the proposed project.

Alternative 2: Areas of Change Reduction/Reduced Project Alternative

Description: This alternative would include the same PlaceTypes as the proposed project, but would reduce the intensity of land uses in three areas: Mid-City, Downtown, and the Traffic Circle. Reductions in land use intensity in these areas would be accomplished through limits on building heights in the Downtown area, reducing the amount of in-fill and regional serving uses in the Mid-City area, and reducing or eliminating new commercial and in-fill development in the Traffic Circle area.

Environmental Effects: Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would result in significant unavoidable impacts related to air quality, GHG emissions, and transportation/traffic. However, due to the reduction in intensity of land uses in the Downtown, Mid-City, and Traffic Circle areas under Alternative 2, overall impacts would be less than with the proposed project.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would implement 14 new PlaceTypes and design standards included in the LUE and UDE. However, this alternative would not achieve certain Project Objectives to the same extent as the proposed project due to land use reductions in three areas of the City.

Alternative 2 would promote livability, environmental quality, community health and safety, the quality of the built environment, and economic vitality (Objective 1) through implementation of the LUE and UDE. While Alternative 2 would include many of the features of the proposed project, this alternative's consistency with the overall LUE goals (Objective 2), job growth (Objective 4), and land use changes that coincide with the regional economy (Objective 5) would be achieved at a lesser extent due to the reduction in land use intensities in the Downtown, Mid City, and Traffic Circle Areas. In addition, Alternative 2 would include PlaceTypes that encourage sustainable development practices consisting of placemaking principles and design standards to create walkable and complete neighborhoods (Objectives 3, 13, 14, 16, and 17). This alternative would achieve many of the Project Objectives related to the provision of diverse housing types, as well as preserving existing neighborhoods (Objectives 6, 7, and 8). The Open Space PlaceType under Alternative 2 would ensure access to natural and urban open spaces, as well as their maintenance, restoration, and preservation (Objectives 11, 12, and 15). Similar to the proposed project, the 14 PlaceTypes would be distributed across the planning areas to ensure planning decisions are equitable and City investments are distributed in a manner to serve both new and existing developments in the City (Objectives 9 and 10). This alternative would meet many of the Project Objectives but not to the same degree as the proposed project.

Finding: On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve the Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed project. In light of these considerations, the Areas of Change Reduction/Reduced Project Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed project and is rejected from further consideration.

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

Alternative 3: Reduced VMT Alternative/Transit-Oriented Alternative

Description: The Reduced VMT Alternative would implement only the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone. This alternative would recognize the objectives of Senate Bill 743 by reducing VMT per capita in order to improve the efficiency of the transportation network. This alternative would be an amendment to the City's existing LUE and would be implemented as an Overlay Zone intended to focus on development around existing and/or proposed transit to reduce the frequency and length of trips. Alternative 3 would not include a new UDE, but would amend the SRE to include design guidelines within the Transit-Oriented Overlay Zone.

Environmental Effects: Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would result in significant unavoidable air quality, GHG emissions, and transportation/traffic impacts. However, because this alternative only proposes the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone, development would be limited to specific transit corridors in the City, resulting in fewer significant adverse traffic impacts. Despite the substantially reduced scale of the project, Alternative 3 would continue to result in significant and adverse GHG emission impacts. The overall impacts for Alternative 3 would be less than with the proposed project due to the reduced amount of construction and development.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: Alternative 3 would implement only one new PlaceType/Overlay Zone with two variations, the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType- Low and Moderate, in selected areas of the City. Because this alternative would not include the remaining 12 PlaceTypes included in the proposed project, this alternative would not achieve many of the Project Objectives.

This alternative's promotion of livability, environmental quality, community health and safety, the quality of the built environment, and economic vitality (Objective 1) would be limited to the transit areas near this PlaceType. Alternative 3 would not include the PlaceTypes that include many of the features of the proposed project, and therefore, this alternative's consistency with the overall LUE goals (Objective 2), job growth (Objective 4), and land use changes that coincide with the regional economy (Objective 5) would be achieved at a lesser extent than with the proposed project. Due to the urbanized nature of the select areas subject to the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone, the restoration of natural reserves and the creation of "Great Places" would not be achieved under this alternative (Objectives 12 and 13).

The Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone would directly encourage development near existing and/or proposed transit with the direct intent of creating compact development patterns and walkable neighborhoods, consistent with Objectives 3, 14, 16, and 17.

This alternative would diversify housing options and provide both affordable and market-rate units in the City, but these improvements would be limited to areas near existing and/or proposed transit (Objectives 6 and 7). The Long Beach Boulevard corridor and associated Metro Blue Line stations are generally located in the central part of the City, and, therefore, only a limited portion of the City would be subject to this proposed PlaceType.

The Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone includes consideration of transitions between large and small-scale developments to protect existing low-density neighborhoods (Objective 8). Parks are permitted within the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType/Overlay Zone and would integrate accessible open spaces into the urban environment (Objectives 11 and 15). This PlaceType would be generally distributed along the Long Beach Boulevard corridor and future planning decisions would be made transparently to ensure City investments are distributed in an equitable manner (Objectives 9 and 10). This alternative would meet some but not all of the Project Objectives, and not to the same degree as the proposed project.

Finding: On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve the Project Objectives at all or to the same degree as the proposed project. In light of these considerations, the Reduced VMT Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed project and is rejected from further consideration.

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

separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve the Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed project. In light of these considerations, the Reduced VMT Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed project and is rejected from further consideration.

Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative (Alternative 4)

Description: The Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative would include the same PlaceTypes as the proposed project, but would eliminate the residential component from the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors PlaceType. The overall 2040 build-out square footage would remain consistent with the proposed project.

Environmental Effects: Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would result in significant unavoidable impacts related to air quality, GHG emissions, and traffic impacts. However, due to the elimination of residential uses from the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors PlaceType under Alternative 4, overall impacts to noise, public services, and utilities would be incrementally less than with the proposed project.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives: Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would include 14 PlaceTypes and design standards included in the LUE and UDE. However, because it would modify the allowed uses in one PlaceType, this alternative would achieve most of the Project Objectives but to a lesser extent than the proposed project.

Alternative 4 would include 14 PlaceTypes and design standards to promote livability, environmental quality, community health and safety, the quality of the built environment, and economic vitality (Objective 1). While Alternative 4 would include many of the features of the proposed project, this alternative's elimination of residential uses in the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors PlaceType would reduce the housing opportunities in the planning area and potential opportunities to offer mixed-use housing within the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors PlaceType (Objectives 6 and 7).

While this alternative would have reduced consistency with housing-related objectives, when compared to the proposed project, Alternative 4 is consistent with a number of defined Project Objectives. Alternative 4 is consistent with eight Major Areas of Change (Objective 2), increased opportunities for job growth (Objective 4), and land use changes that coincide with the regional economy (Objective 5). In addition, Alternative 4 would include PlaceTypes that encourage sustainable development practices comprised of placemaking principles and design standards to create walkable and complete neighborhoods (Objectives 3, 13, 14, 16, and 17). This alternative would not change the nature of housing opportunities in proposed low-density areas and/or existing neighborhoods (Objective 8). The Open Space PlaceType under Alternative 4 would ensure access to natural and urban open spaces, as well their maintenance, restoration, and preservation (Objectives 11, 12, and 15). Similar to the proposed project, the 14 PlaceTypes would be distributed across the planning areas to ensure planning decisions are equitable and City investments are distributed in a manner to serve both new and existing developments in the City (Objectives 9 and 10). This alternative would meet many of the Project Objectives but not to the same degree as the proposed project.

Finding: On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve the Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed project. In light of these considerations, the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed project and is rejected from further consideration.

Facts in Support of the Finding: Fundamental objectives of the proposed project include accommodating projected increases in population; providing additional community services; diversifying the local economy; encouraging sustainable development practices; retaining the character and quality of existing neighborhoods in the City; and providing additional options for housing and mobility. The Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative would not allow for the same degree of new development as proposed as part of the project, and as such, would not be able to meet the City's full demand for new housing units, community services, diverse business opportunities, sustainable development, and aesthetic improvements. For these reasons, this alternative would not maximize the potential of the project and would not meet the needs of the community. Future development under this alternative would also generate significantly less revenue due to the reduction in housing units and employment opportunities as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, the reduction of proposed development under this alternative would result in a less positive contribution to the City than the proposed project. This alternative would be inconsistent with some of the Project Objectives, would not fully meet other Project Objectives, and overall would not provide the same benefits as the proposed project. On balance, the environmental benefits that might be achieved with this alternative are outweighed, independently and separately, by the alternative's failure to achieve the Project Objectives to the same degree as the proposed project. In light of these considerations, the Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative is less desirable to the City than the proposed project and is rejected from further consideration.

IV. GENERAL FINDINGS

1. The plans for the proposed project have been prepared and analyzed to provide for public involvement in the planning and CEQA processes.
2. To the degree that any impacts described in the Final EIR are perceived to have a less than significant effect on the environment or that such impacts appear ambiguous as to their effect on the environment as discussed in the Draft EIR, the City has responded to key environmental issues and has incorporated mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential environmental effects of the proposed project to the maximum extent feasible.
3. Comments regarding the Draft EIR received during the public review period have been adequately responded to in written Responses to Comments included in the Final EIR. Any significant effects described in such comments were avoided or substantially lessened by the standard conditions and mitigation measures described in the Final EIR.
4. The analysis of the environmental effects and mitigation measures contained in the Draft EIR and the Final EIR represents the independent judgment and analysis of the City of Long Beach.