

Southeast Area Specific Plan (SEASP) Program Environmental Impact Report  
Compliance Checklist  
6398 E. Pacific Coast Highway  
Application No. 1903-16 (SPR19-008, LCDP19-003, MOD19-009)  
September 5, 2019

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Aesthetics</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (5.1-1)	Less Than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (5.1-2)	Less Than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (5.1-3)	Less Than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (5.1-4)	Less Than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

The SEASP PEIR found that most of the Project area's notable viewsheds are those visible from major arterial highways, including 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Studebaker Road, and Pacific Coast Hwy (PCH). 2<sup>nd</sup> Street traverses the Project area in an east-west orientation and offer close-range views of the Los Cerritos Wetlands and distant view of the San Gabriel Mountains. Distant views of the San Gabriel Mountains are already limited and would not be further obstructed since the alignment of the roadway (and related eastward sightline) would be maintained.

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

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

Upon buildout of the proposed Specific Plan, the PCH corridor would experience the most change in land uses and building intensity, including the introduction of pedestrian-oriented mixed uses, a modified street scene along PCH, and buildings up to seven stories tall. However, the Specific Plan includes extensive development standards and design guidelines aimed at providing new “water and wetlands” view corridors along PCH.

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

The proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. Upon implementation of the project, adverse impacts to existing scenic views would be less than significant.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

*b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

The SEASP PEIR found that the closest State scenic highway is PCH. PCH traverses the Project area in a northwest-southeast direction through existing residential and commercial neighborhoods, including the Colorado Street neighborhood, Spinnaker/Bay Harbor neighborhood, Loynes neighborhood, and Marina Pacifica and Marketplace Districts. The eligible segment of the highway spans from the intersection of PCH and

Lakewood Boulevard in the northwest portion of the Project area to south Orange County in the city of Dana Point.

Although the relevant segment of PCH is not officially designated as a scenic highway, there are scenic views visible from PCH. Viewshed B is along the bridge over the Los Cerritos Channel and provides views towards Jack Nichol Park, the Los Cerritos Wetlands, several hotels and restaurants with parking areas (e.g., Best Western and Acapulco), and the marina. Viewshed C includes views of the Los Cerritos Wetlands to the east and commercial uses and parking areas to the west. Viewshed L provides views of the Marina Shores and Marketplace District commercial uses and parking areas. Viewshed K provides views of the bridge over the San Gabriel River.

However, because PCH is not an officially designed scenic highway in the Project area, and because buildout of the proposed Project area would concentrate new development and redevelopment in areas that already feature urban uses, adverse impacts to scenic views visible from a state scenic highway would be minimal. Furthermore, development standards and design guidelines in the Specific Plan include provisions aimed at protecting existing viewsheds and promoting the creation of new “water and wetlands” view corridors along PCH.

The proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. Therefore, impacts related to state scenic highways would be less than significant.

### ***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

*c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

The SEASP PEIR found that buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would allow for the development of an additional 5,439 dwelling units and 573,576 square feet of nonresidential building space in the Project area compared to existing conditions. The Specific Plan would establish the necessary plans, development standards, regulations, infrastructure requirements, design guidelines, and implementation programs on which subsequent project-related development activities would be founded.

The project is located within the PCH Corridor, which consists of the proposed Mixed-Use Community Core designation with the existing commercial corridor that includes the Marina Pacific Mall, Marketplace, Seaport Marina Hotel, and Marina Shores shopping center. This area is envisioned as the primary activity center in the Project area and provides for a mix of uses including residential, regional retail, hotel, and office uses. The focus of this designation is on creating a pedestrian scale environment, including increased connectivity, gathering spaces, and linkages to the marina and wetlands. Permitted, conditionally permitted and prohibited uses for this designation are identified in Table 4-4, Permitted Uses, of the Specific Plan.

The proposed project is within the Marina Pacifica Mall. It consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. It complies with all applicable development standards and regulations of SEASP. Development within Marina Pacifica Mall was anticipated within the Project area buildout and therefore, adverse aesthetic impacts along the PCH corridor would be less than significant, with no mitigation being necessary.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

*d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

SEASP is a highly urbanized and built out area, and there are many existing sources of nighttime illumination. These include street and parking area lights, security lighting, and interior/exterior lighting on existing buildings. The Project area is also highly traveled by people driving in and out of the Long Beach area, which causes additional day and nighttime light and glare. Existing commercial, office, and industrial land uses throughout the Project area are not considered sensitive land uses with regard to nighttime lighting and glare. However, there are a few sensitive land uses within the area, which include single-family residences, multifamily residences, mobile homes, and one school. Additionally, many of the areas surrounding the Project area include single- and multifamily residences.

The proposed project would alter and intensify land uses and their related lighting sources in the Specific Plan area by introducing two new buildings (with both interior and exterior lighting), security, sign, and parking lights. In addition to necessary lighting for safety and security, the proposed project would also introduce aesthetic lighting, to complement the existing illumination of the Marina Pacific Mall. Although additional sources of light glare can be introduced with the incorporation of large expanses of windows and certain building materials, the proposed project is consistent with the quality of development currently encompassing the Marina Pacific Mall. Furthermore, to ensure that new development in the Project area does not generate excessive light and glare, SEASP includes numerous design guidelines aimed at reducing the impacts of light and glare on adjacent land uses. These guidelines include standards related to aesthetics, energy efficiency, safety, and protection of biological resources.

Overall, lighting and glare impacts associated with the proposed project (construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall) would not substantially increase nighttime light and glare in the Specific Plan area or its surroundings. Compliance with components of the Specific Plan and the City's Municipal

Code would ensure that development in the Project area would not produce a substantial increase in light or glare. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Agricultural Resources</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (5.2-1)	Less Than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (5.2-2)	Less Than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? (5.2-3)	Less Than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (5.2-3)	Less Than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. (5.2-1, 5.2-3)	Less Than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The SEASP PEIR found no impact to farmland, agricultural land or uses, or with the agricultural zoning of Williamson Act contracts. The project site is located within an urbanized area with no agricultural uses therefore no further study of these issues is warranted.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***



	<b>SEASP PEIR Determination</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR</b>	<b>No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR</b>
<b>Impact Area:      Air Quality</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (5.3-1)	Significant and Unavoidable (even after mitigation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. (5.3-2, 5.3-3)	Significant and Unavoidable (even after mitigation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (5.3-2, 5.3-3)	Significant and Unavoidable (even after mitigation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (5.3-4, 5.3-5)	Significant and Unavoidable (even after mitigation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. (5.3-6)	Significant and Unavoidable (even after mitigation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

The SEASP PEIR found that plan implementation would represent a substantial increase in emissions compared to existing conditions and would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) regional operational significance thresholds, despite furthering the regional transportation and planning objectives of SCAQMD. As a result, SEASP could potentially exceed the assumptions in SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and would not be considered consistent with the AQMP. Consequently, impacts would be potentially significant. Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, AQ-4, and AQ-6 were included to apply to project-level development review (AQ-5 only pertains to residential projects):

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1** – The project applicant shall require the construction contractor to use equipment that meets the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 4 emissions standards for off-road diesel-powered construction equipment with more than 50 horsepower, unless it can be demonstrated to the City of Long Beach that such equipment is not available. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 4 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine, as defined by the California Air Resources Board's regulations.

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

**Mitigation Measure AQ-2** – The project applicant shall require the construction contractor to prepare a dust control plan and implement the following measures during ground-disturbing activities—in addition to the existing requirements for fugitive dust control under South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403—to further reduce PM10 and PM2.5 emissions. The City of Long Beach shall verify that these measures have been implemented during normal construction site inspections.

- Following all grading activities, the construction contractor shall reestablish ground cover on the construction site through seeding and watering.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall sweep streets with SCAQMD Rule 1186-compliant, PM10-efficient vacuum units on a daily basis if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares or occurs as a result of hauling.

- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall maintain a minimum 24-inch freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials and shall tarp materials with a fabric cover or other cover that achieves the same amount of protection.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall water exposed ground surfaces and disturbed areas a minimum of every three hours on the construction site and a minimum of three times per day.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall limit onsite vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to no more than 15 miles per hour.

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

**Mitigation Measure AQ-4** – Prior to issuance of a building permit, the property owner/developer shall show on the building plans that all major appliances (dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers) to be provided/installed are Energy Star appliances. Installation of Energy Star appliances shall be verified by the City of Long Beach prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

**Mitigation Measure AQ-6** – Prior to issuance of building permits, the property owner/developer shall indicate on the building plans that the following features have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Long Beach prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

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

The impact of the SEASP plan being inconsistent with SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan would be reduced by the following alternatives, however, no alternative would reduce this impact to a less than significant level:

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

- Reduced Intensity

Only the “No Project/No Development” alternative would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The developer will be required to comply with all mitigation measures (AQ1-AQ-4, AQ-6) and conditions of approval, upon submission of construction documents for the proposed project.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

*b) Would the Project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?*

Construction activities associated with buildout of SEASP are anticipated to occur sporadically over approximately 20 years or more. Buildout would comprise multiple smaller projects undertaken by individual developers/project applicants, such as the proposed project consisting of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. The SEASP PEIR found that construction activities associated with the SEASP plan could potentially exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) and Nitrogen Oxides (NOX). The primary source of NOX emissions is exhaust from vehicles and construction equipment. NOX is a precursor to the formation of both Ozone (O3) and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). VOC is produced by equipment exhaust and off-gas of architectural coatings and paving. VOC is a precursor to the formation of O3. Project-related emissions of VOC and NOX would contribute to the O3, Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2), PM10, and PM2.5 nonattainment designations of the Southern California Air Basin (SoCAB). Therefore, Project-related construction activities would result in significant regional air quality impacts. Because cumulative development within SEASP would exceed the regional significance thresholds, construction within the Project area could contribute to an increase in health effects in the basin until such time as the attainment standard are met. Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3 were included to apply to project-level development review:

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1** – The project applicant shall require the construction contractor to use equipment that meets the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 4 emissions standards for off-road diesel-powered construction equipment with more than 50 horsepower, unless it can be demonstrated to the City of Long Beach that such equipment is not available. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 4 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine, as defined by the California Air Resources Board’s regulations.

Prior to construction, the project engineer shall ensure that all demolition and grading plans clearly show the requirement for EPA Tier 4 or higher emissions standards for construction equipment over 50 horsepower. During construction, the construction contractor shall maintain a list of all operating equipment in use on the construction site

for verification by the City of Long Beach. The construction equipment list shall state the makes, models, and numbers of construction equipment onsite. Equipment shall be properly serviced and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. Construction contractors shall also ensure that all nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less in compliance with California Air Resources Board's Rule 2449.

**Mitigation Measure AQ-2** – The project applicant shall require the construction contractor to prepare a dust control plan and implement the following measures during ground-disturbing activities—in addition to the existing requirements for fugitive dust control under South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403—to further reduce PM10 and PM2.5 emissions. The City of Long Beach shall verify that these measures have been implemented during normal construction site inspections.

- Following all grading activities, the construction contractor shall reestablish ground cover on the construction site through seeding and watering.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall sweep streets with SCAQMD Rule 1186-compliant, PM10-efficient vacuum units on a daily basis if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares or occurs as a result of hauling.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall maintain a minimum 24-inch freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials and shall tarp materials with a fabric cover or other cover that achieves the same amount of protection.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall water exposed ground surfaces and disturbed areas a minimum of every three hours on the construction site and a minimum of three times per day.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall limit onsite vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to no more than 15 miles per hour.

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

The impact of construction activities generating an increase in short-term air pollutant emissions would be reduced by the following alternatives, however, no alternative would reduce this impact to a less than significant level:

- No Project/Adopted PD-1 (SEADIP)
- No Project/No Development
- Reduced Intensity

Only the “No Project/No Development” alternative would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (AQ1, AQ-2, AQ-3) and conditions of approval, upon submission of construction documents and during construction activities for the proposed project.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

*c) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).*

The SEASP PEIR found that buildout of SEASP would result in direct and indirect criteria air pollutant emissions from transportation, energy (natural gas use), and area sources (e.g., natural gas fireplaces, aerosols, landscaping equipment). Development that would be accommodated by SEASP would generate a net increase of 51,866 gross weekday average daily trips ends (35,439 external weekday average daily trips), resulting in 305,044 additional daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) at full Project buildout. Implementation of SEASP would result in a significant impact because it would significantly contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Because cumulative development within SEASP would exceed the regional significance thresholds, the proposed project could contribute to an increase in health effects in the basin. Mitigation Measures AQ-4 and AQ-6 were included to apply to project-level (non-residential) development review:

**Mitigation Measure AQ-4** – Prior to issuance of a building permit, the property owner/developer shall show on the building plans that all major appliances (dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers) to be provided/installed are Energy Star appliances. Installation of Energy Star appliances shall be verified by the City of Long Beach prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

**Mitigation Measure AQ-6** – Prior to issuance of building permits, the property owner/developer shall indicate on the building plans that the following features have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Long Beach prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

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

The impact of construction activities generating a substantial increase in criteria air pollutant emissions would be reduced by the following alternatives, however, no alternative would reduce this impact to a less than significant level:

- No Project/Adopted PD-1 (SEADIP)
- No Project/No Development
- Reduced Intensity

Only the “No Project/No Development” alternative would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (AQ4, AQ-6) and conditions of approval, upon submission of construction documents and during construction activities for the proposed project.

### ***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

#### ***d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.***

The SEASP PEIR found that the proposed project could expose sensitive receptors (asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise) to elevated pollutant concentrations during construction activities if it would cause or contribute significantly to elevating those levels. Buildout of SEASP would occur over a period of approximately 20 years or longer and would comprise several smaller projects with their own construction time frame and construction equipment, such as the proposed project which consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. Concentrations of criteria air pollutants generated by the proposed project depend on the emissions generated onsite and the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor. The proposed project is located in the Marina Pacific Mall, which is in the immediate vicinity of several multifamily residential properties (some of which could possibly house young children and elderly). Therefore, construction equipment exhaust combined with fugitive particulate matter emissions has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of criteria air pollutant emissions and result in a significant impact.

The SEASP PEIR also found that operation of new land uses would generate new sources of criteria air pollutants and Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs). Operation of nonresidential structures in SEASP would include occasional use of landscaping equipment, natural gas consumption for heating, and nominal truck idling for vendor deliveries. The proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall and would not involve warehousing or similar uses where substantial truck idling could occur onsite. Onsite emissions from nonresidential uses from onsite energy use (natural gas used for cooking and water heating) and other onsite sources (e.g., landscaping fuel, aerosols) would not generate substantial concentrations of emissions or exacerbate existing health risk in the area.

Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3 (for non-industrial uses) were included to apply to project-level development review:

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1** – The project applicant shall require the construction contractor to use equipment that meets the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 4 emissions standards for off-road diesel-powered construction equipment with more than 50 horsepower, unless it can be demonstrated to the City of Long Beach that such equipment is not available. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 4 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine, as defined by the California Air Resources Board's regulations.

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

**Mitigation Measure AQ-2** – The project applicant shall require the construction contractor to prepare a dust control plan and implement the following measures during ground-disturbing activities—in addition to the existing requirements for fugitive dust control under South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403—to further reduce PM10 and PM2.5 emissions. The City of Long Beach shall verify that these measures have been implemented during normal construction site inspections.

- Following all grading activities, the construction contractor shall reestablish ground cover on the construction site through seeding and watering.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall sweep streets with SCAQMD Rule 1186-compliant, PM10-efficient vacuum units on a daily basis if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares or occurs as a result of hauling.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall maintain a minimum 24-inch freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials and shall tarp materials with a fabric cover or other cover that achieves the same amount of protection.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall water exposed ground surfaces and disturbed areas a minimum of every three hours on the construction site and a minimum of three times per day.
- During all construction activities, the construction contractor shall limit onsite vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to no more than 15 miles per hour.



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

The impact of construction activities generating a substantial increase in criteria air pollutant emissions would be reduced by the following alternatives, however, no alternative would reduce this impact to a less than significant level:

- No Project/Adopted PD-1 (SEADIP)
- No Project/No Development
- Reduced Intensity

The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (AQ1, AQ-2, AQ-3) and conditions of approval, upon submission of construction documents and during construction activities for the proposed project.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

*e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.*

The SEASP PEIR found that the proposed project, which consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall, would not emit objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. The type of facilities that are considered to have objectionable odors include wastewater treatments plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. Odors generated by the two new commercial buildings are not expected to be significant or highly objectionable. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Biological Resources</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (5.4-1, 5.4-2)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (5.4-1, 5.4-2)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (5.4-3)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (5.4-4)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Biological Resources</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (5.4-5)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) <i>Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</i>			
b) <i>Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</i>			

The SEASP PEIR found that buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would allow for the development of an additional 5,439 dwelling units and 573,576 square feet of nonresidential building space in the SEASP area compared to existing conditions. The Specific Plan allows new development to be concentrated along the Pacific Coast Highway commercial corridor within the proposed Mixed-Use Community Core and Mixed-Use Marina land uses (of which the project site is located in). These areas of change are entirely developed and do not include native habitat or other suitable habitat for sensitive species, with the exception of natural water quality features and ornamental trees.

Indirect noise impacts may occur to wildlife during project construction and operation. Construction noise to sensitive wildlife could result from demolition, grading, and building activities. Noise and vibration associated with the use of heavy equipment during project construction has the potential to disrupt wildlife foraging and breeding behavior. As discussed in Section 5.12, *Noise*, construction equipment generates high levels of noise, with maximums ranging from 71 dBA to 101 dBA. The ambient noise levels in the Project area represent typical noise levels for a highly urbanized area with heavily traveled

roadways. However, construction noise levels would exceed the existing ambient conditions and could disrupt wildlife if they occur adjacent to or near sensitive areas. Mitigation Measures BIO-4 was included to address noise-related concerns generated from construction activities:

**Mitigation Measure BIO-4** – The project applicant shall require the construction contractor to use coatings and solvents with a volatile organic compound (VOC) content lower than required under South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113 (i.e., super compliant paints). The construction contractor shall also use precoated/natural-colored building materials, where feasible. Use of low-VOC paints and spray method shall be included as a note on architectural building plans and verified by the City of Long Beach during construction.

The proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall, an urbanized commercial center. The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (BIO-4), which require noise-reduction tasks during construction activities.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

The SEASP PEIR found that potential indirect impacts to wetlands from adjacent development could include lighting, noise, runoff, and human intrusion. To avoid indirect impacts to wetlands, wetland buffers are required (SEASP Section 5.10) to address the specific type and intensity of these impacts from adjacent development. The proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall, a completely developed commercial center, where buffers are already established. Because the project site does not consist of undeveloped land, is not adjacent to undeveloped land, and is not within the Coastal Habitat or Wetlands, further study of this issue is not warranted.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.*

A portion of the San Gabriel River is within the Project area; however, it will not be directly impacted by implementation of the Specific Plan, or the proposed project. The preservation of wetlands in the Project area substantially reduces impacts to migrating bird species in the Pacific Flyway. The proposed project consists of the construction of

two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall, a commercial center that is already completely developed.

Although the proposed project will not result in the removal of existing ornamental trees, projects undertaken in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan would also be required to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), which implements the United States' commitment to four treaties with Canada, Japan, Mexico, and Russia for the protection of shared migratory bird resources. The MBTA governs the take, kill, possession, transport, and import of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests. Compliance with MBTA would ensure that trees and nests will not be removed during the breeding season. Mitigation Measure BIO-8 was included to apply to project-level development review:

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

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

The SEASP PEIR found that the impact of affecting wildlife movement would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures. The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (BIO-8) and conditions of approval, upon commencement of and during construction activities for the proposed project.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

- e) *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.*
- f) *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.*

The SEASP PEIR found that the Project area is not in a habitat conservation plan, a natural community conservation plan, or any other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts with respect to a habitat conservation plan would occur. Further, the proposed project does not include the removal of any trees of significance. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Cultural Resources</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5? (5.5-1)	Significant and Unavoidable (even after mitigation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? (5.5-2)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (5.5-2)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (5.5-3)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074 (5.5-2)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?*

The SEASP PEIR found that one California-listed Point of Historic Interest and Historical Landmark exists adjacent to SEASP: Long Beach Marine Stadium. In addition to the resource that has been officially designated, other structures and landmarks have the potential to meet National or State Register criteria. A resource may be considered historical even if it is not officially registered on the National and State Register or local list. Under CEQA, a project has a significant impact on a historical resource if it “would result in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resources would be materially impaired” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(1)). Material impairment

would occur if the project would result in demolition or material alteration of those physical characteristics that convey the resource's historical significance (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(2)). Because the project site is located within the Marina Pacific Mall, it is already fully developed and there are no known historical resources in this area. The proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. Therefore, further study of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

- b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?*
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.*

The SEASP PEIR found that the development of projects within SEASP, including infrastructure improvements, could impact known archaeological sites. There are six known archaeological sites documented within the SEASP. Locations of archaeological sites in each site are kept confidential due to their sensitive nature. The Project area is considered highly sensitive for archaeological resources. The vast majority of the Project area is built out. However, development on vacant parcels or redevelopment of taller buildings (the proposed Specific Plan allows up to seven stories in some locations) could involve ground disturbance to greater depths and previously disturbed areas. As the proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall, a completely built out commercial center, it is not defined as development on a vacant parcel and does not consist of the incorporation of taller buildings. Nevertheless, since ground disturbance has the potential to uncover archeological resources, this is considered a potentially significant impact.

The SEASP PEIR also states that several vertebrate fossil localities have been discovered in the southern part of the City of Long Beach, including one in the SEASP area. The SEASP area is considered sensitive for paleontological resources, and the older Quaternary alluvial deposits have the potential to yield fossils. Specific Plan buildout would entail development and redevelopment within the Project area. Grading and excavations deeper than the existing development areas and previously disturbed areas have the potential to impact significant fossils. This is a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measures CUL-3 and CUL-4 were included to apply to project-level development review to address impacts to archeological and paleontological resources that may result:

**Mitigation Measure CUL-3** - Prior to the issuance of grading permits, and for any subsequent permit involving excavation to increased depth, the project applicant for each development or redevelopment project considered for approval pursuant to the Southeast



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

**Mitigation Measure CUL-4** - At least 30 days prior to ground disturbance by each project developed or redeveloped in conformance with the Specific Plan, the City of Long Beach would notify the three Native American tribal representatives who requested Native American monitoring of ground-disturbing activities. For each project, the project applicant would retain one certified Native American monitor who would accompany the professional archaeological monitor during on-call monitoring. The Native American monitor would have the same authority to halt activities that could adversely impact archaeological or tribal cultural resources that the professional archaeological monitor would. The Native American monitor would recover Native American archaeological and/or tribal cultural resources, as practicable, and would convey such resources to the pertinent tribe or most likely descendant, as applicable.

The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (CUL-3, CUL-4,) and conditions of approval, upon commencement of and during construction activities for the proposed project.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

- d) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

The SEASP PEIR found that the Project area is considered archeologically sensitive, and the prehistoric background has indicated that the area was occupied by Native Americans. One tribal representative indicated that there is the potential for human burials within the Project area. Therefore, ground disturbance by projects developed pursuant to the proposed Specific Plan could encounter human remains. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, and impacts are potentially significant. Mitigation Measure CUL-6 was included to apply to project-level development review:

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

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

*e) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

The SEASP PEIR found that the development of projects within SEASP, including infrastructure improvements, could impact known archaeological sites. There are six known archaeological sites documented within the SEASP. Locations of archaeological sites in each site are kept confidential due to their sensitive nature. The Project area is considered highly sensitive for archaeological resources. The vast majority of the Project area is built out. However, development on vacant parcels or redevelopment of taller buildings (the proposed Specific Plan allows up to seven stories in some locations) could involve ground disturbance to greater depths and previously disturbed areas. As the proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall, a completely built out commercial center, it is not defined as development on a vacant parcel and does not consist of the incorporation of taller buildings. Nevertheless, since ground disturbance has the potential to uncover archeological resources, this is considered a potentially significant impact.

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

Mitigation Measures CUL-3 and CUL-4 were included to apply to project-level development review to address impacts to archeological and paleontological resources that may result:

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

**Mitigation Measure CUL-4** - At least 30 days prior to ground disturbance by each project developed or redeveloped in conformance with the Specific Plan, the City of Long Beach would notify the three Native American tribal representatives who requested Native American monitoring of ground-disturbing activities. For each project, the project applicant would retain one certified Native American monitor who would accompany the professional archaeological monitor during on-call monitoring. The Native American monitor would have the same authority to halt activities that could adversely impact archaeological or tribal cultural resources that the professional archaeological monitor would. The Native American monitor would recover Native American archaeological and/or tribal cultural resources, as practicable, and would convey such resources to the pertinent tribe or most likely descendant, as applicable.

The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (CUL-3, CUL-4,) and conditions of approval, upon commencement of and during construction activities for the proposed project.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area:        Geology/Soils</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42? (5.6-1)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (5.6-2)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (5.6-3)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
iv) Landslides? (5.6-4)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (5.9-5)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (5.6-5)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	■

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area:      Geology/Soils</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (5.6-5)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? (5.6-6)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) <i>Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</i>			
i) <i>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?</i>			
ii) <i>Strong seismic ground shaking?</i>			
iii) <i>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</i>			
iv) <i>Landslides?</i>			
b) <i>Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</i>			
c) <i>Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</i>			
d) <i>Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</i>			

- e) *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?*

The SEASP PEIR found that geology and soils impacts are site specific and generally do not combine with impacts of other projects to result in cumulative impacts. Other projects would be required to have site-specific geotechnical investigations conducted. Other projects would be designed and built in compliance with the CBC, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and Seismic Hazard Zoning Act. Geology and soils impacts of each related project would be less than significant after compliance with recommendations in the project's geotechnical investigation report and with existing laws and regulations. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant, and project impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (5.7-1)	Significant and Unavoidable (even after mitigation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases? (5.7-2)	Significant and Unavoidable (even after mitigation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

The SEASP PEIR found that development under the Project area would contribute to global climate change through direct and indirect emissions of GHG from land uses within SEASP. Buildout of the Project area is not linked to a specific development time frame. For the purpose of the SEASP PEIR, buildout is assumed over a 20-year project horizon. GHG emissions from construction activities are amortized into the operational phase GHG emissions inventory to account for one-time emissions from construction in accordance with SCAQMD methodology.

The increase in overall land use intensity and associated population and employment growth within the SEASP boundaries is the primary factor for the increase in overall GHG emissions. Under SEASP, increase in land use development would result in a 92 percent increase in the total service population. Although SEASP would result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions, it would also result in a 38 percent decrease in GHG emissions per person. However, although implementation of SEASP would result in a decrease in GHG emissions per capita, it would not meet the SCAQMD Year 2035 target efficiency metric of 2.2 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/year/SP based on the long-term GHG reduction goals of Executive Order S-03-05 and Executive Order B-30-15. Additional state and local actions are necessary to achieve the post-2020 GHG reduction goals for the state. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has released the 2014 Scoping Plan Update to identify a path for the state to achieve additional GHG reductions. The new Executive

Order B-30-15 requires CARB to prepare another update to the Scoping Plan to address the 2030 target for the state. However, at this time, no additional GHG reductions programs have been outlined that get the state to the post-2020 targets identified in Executive Order S-03-05, which are an 80 percent reduction in 1990 emissions by 2050, or the Executive Order B-30-15, which are a 40 percent reduction in 1990 emissions by 2035. As identified by the California Council on Science and Technology, the state cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advances in technology (CCST 2012). Therefore, SEASP's cumulative contribution to the long-term GHG emissions in the state would be considered potentially significant. Mitigation Measures AQ-4 and AQ-6 were included to apply project-level development review:

**Mitigation Measure AQ-4** – Prior to issuance of a building permit, the property owner/developer shall show on the building plans that all major appliances (dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers) to be provided/installed are Energy Star appliances. Installation of Energy Star appliances shall be verified by the City of Long Beach prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

**Mitigation Measure AQ-6** – Prior to issuance of building permits, the property owner/developer shall indicate on the building plans that the following features have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Long Beach prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

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

The impact of construction activities and future land uses generating greenhouse gas emissions would be reduced by the following alternatives, however, no alternative would reduce this impact to a less than significant level:

- No Project/Adopted PD-1 (SEADIP)
- No Project/No Development
- Reduced Intensity

Only the “No Project/No Development” alternative would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (AQ4, AQ-6) and conditions of approval, upon submission of construction documents and during construction activities for the proposed project.



**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

*b) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?*

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

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

As identified in Section 5.16, Transportation and Traffic, of the SEASP PEIR, implementation of SEASP would result in a decrease in VMT per service population from 45.3 VMT/SP to 36.6 VMT/SP, which is consistent with regional goals to reduce passenger VMT. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
Impact Area: <b>VIII.</b>			
<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (5.8-1)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (5.8-2)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (5.8-1)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (5.8-3)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? (5.8-4)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
Impact Area: <b>VIII.</b> <b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
f) For a project in the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. (5.8-4)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (5.8-5)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? (5.8-6)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

The SEASP PEIR found that the proposed project has the potential create a significant hazard to the public or the environment within the Project area through the accidental release of hazardous materials during the operational and construction phases.

#### Project Operation

Operation of the future commercial uses would involve the use of small amounts of hazardous materials. The types of commercial uses, and thus the types of hazardous materials to be used, are not yet known. However, the use of commercial-grade chemicals, cleaners, and solvents would be anticipated from the proposed retail/commercial uses. The use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials by future commercial tenants/owners of the proposed project would be required to comply with existing regulations of several agencies, including the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, US Environmental Protection Agency, California Division of Occupational Safety and Health, California Department of Transportation, County of Los Angeles Department of Environmental Health, and Long Beach Fire Department.

The proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. It is subject to Planning Commission approval of a Site Plan Review, Local Coastal Development Permit, and a Modification to an Approved Permit. The project is in compliance with all land use and development standards of the PD-1 ordinance. Therefore, hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials during Project operation would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary for the project operation component of the proposed project.

### Project Construction

The SEASP PEIR also found that Construction activities of the proposed project would involve the use of larger amounts of hazardous materials than would project operation. Construction activities would include the use of materials such as fuels, lubricants, and greases in construction equipment and coatings used in construction. However, the materials used would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety hazard. These activities would also be short term or one time in nature. Project construction workers would be trained in safe handling and hazardous materials use. Additionally, as with project operation, the use, storage, transport, and disposal of construction-related hazardous materials and waste would be required to conform to existing laws and regulations.

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

Furthermore, strict adherence to all emergency response plan requirements set forth by the City of Long Beach and LBFD would be required through the duration of the Project construction. Therefore, hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use of hazardous materials during project construction would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary for the construction component of the project.

### *Grading Activities*

Grading activities for the proposed project would involve the disturbance of onsite soils. Soils on certain parcels within SEASP could be contaminated with hazardous materials due to current and historical oil operations, power plants, former landfills, and other commercial land uses. The transport of these materials and exposure to contaminated

soils of workers and the surrounding environment could result in a significant impact. Any contaminated soils encountered on individual development sites would be required to be removed prior to grading activities and disposed of offsite in accordance with all applicable regulatory guidelines. However, to ensure that impacts from potential contaminated soils do not occur or that hazardous materials discovered during grading are properly handled, Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 were included to apply project-level development review:

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

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

The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (HAZ-1, HAZ-2,) and conditions of approval, upon commencement of and during grading activities for the proposed project.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

*b) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

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

All onsite activities, during both operation and construction, would be required to adhere to federal, state, and local regulations for the management and disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, the accidental upset of hazardous materials during construction of new developments in accordance with the proposed Project would be properly managed, and impacts would be less than significant. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

*c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substance, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

The SEASP PEIR found that the proposed project has the potential create a significant hazard to the public or the environment within the Project area through the accidental release of hazardous materials during the operational and construction phases.

**Project Operation**

Operation of the future commercial uses would involve the use of small amounts of hazardous materials. The types of commercial uses, and thus the types of hazardous materials to be used, are not yet known. However, the use of commercial-grade chemicals, cleaners, and solvents would be anticipated from the proposed retail/commercial uses. The use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials by future commercial tenants/owners of the proposed project would be required to comply with existing regulations of several agencies, including the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, US Environmental Protection Agency, California Division of

Occupational Safety and Health, California Department of Transportation, County of Los Angeles Department of Environmental Health, and Long Beach Fire Department.

The proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. It is subject to Planning Commission approval of a Site Plan Review, Local Coastal Development Permit, and a Modification to an Approved Permit. The project is in compliance with all land use and development standards of the PD-1 ordinance. Therefore, hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials during Project operation would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary for the project operation component of the proposed project.

### Project Construction

The SEASP PEIR also found that Construction activities of the proposed project would involve the use of larger amounts of hazardous materials than would project operation. Construction activities would include the use of materials such as fuels, lubricants, and greases in construction equipment and coatings used in construction. However, the materials used would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety hazard. These activities would also be short term or one time in nature. Project construction workers would be trained in safe handling and hazardous materials use. Additionally, as with project operation, the use, storage, transport, and disposal of construction-related hazardous materials and waste would be required to conform to existing laws and regulations.

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

Furthermore, strict adherence to all emergency response plan requirements set forth by the City of Long Beach and LBFD would be required through the duration of the Project construction. Therefore, hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use of hazardous materials during project construction would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary for the construction component of the project.

### *Grading Activities*

Grading activities for the proposed project would involve the disturbance of onsite soils. Soils on certain parcels within SEASP could be contaminated with hazardous materials due to current and historical oil operations, power plants, former landfills, and other commercial land uses. The transport of these materials and exposure to contaminated soils of workers and the surrounding environment could result in a significant impact. Any contaminated soils encountered on individual development sites would be required to be removed prior to grading activities and disposed of offsite in accordance with all applicable regulatory guidelines. However, to ensure that impacts from potential contaminated soils do not occur or that hazardous materials discovered during grading are properly handled, Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 were included to apply project-level development review:

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

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



The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (HAZ-1, HAZ-2,) and conditions of approval, upon commencement of and during grading activities for the proposed project.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

d) *Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

The SEASP PEIR found that due to the fact that there are numerous sites within and in proximity of the Project area that have been listed in a hazardous materials database, the potential for impacts exists from hazardous substance contamination. Individual development projects that would be allowed under the Southeast Area Specific Plan could impact areas of hazardous substance contamination existing or remaining from historical operations, resulting in a significant impact on the environment. Impacting these areas may also pose a significant health risk to existing and future residents and/or workers.

Hazardous substance contaminated properties are regulated at the federal, state, and local level, and are subject to compliance with stringent laws and regulations for investigation and remediation. The proposed project would be required to comply with these existing laws and regulations. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 were included to apply project-level development review:

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

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

The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (HAZ-1, HAZ-2,) and conditions of approval, upon commencement of and during grading activities for the proposed project.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

*e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

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

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

*f) For a project in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would it result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

There are no private air strips adjacent to or within the vicinity of the Project area. The closest private heliport is the Kilroy AC8-Long Beach Heliport near the Long Beach Municipal Airport, approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the Project area. Other private heliports in the City are located toward downtown Long Beach and the Port of Long Beach and include the Long Beach Memorial Medical Center Heliport, St. Mary Medical Center Heliport, Queen Mary Heliport, Queensway Bay Heliport, and NAA Long Beach Port Heliport (Airnav.com 2014). Over congested areas, helicopters are required to maintain an altitude of at least 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within 2,000 feet of the aircraft, except as needed for takeoff and landing (Code of Federal Regulations Title 14 § 91.119). Additionally, helicopter takeoffs and landings at these private heliports are sporadic and far enough from the Project area that they would not pose a hazard to future residents and workers of the proposed Project. Therefore, Project development would not cause any hazards related to aircraft operating to or from private airstrips or heliports, and no mitigation measures are necessary. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

*g) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

The SEASP PEIR found that future development would not interfere with any of the daily operations of the City's Emergency Operation Center, LBFD, or Long Beach Police Department. Immediate access to the project area is provided by the I-405, I-605, SR-22, PCH, 7th Street, and 2nd Street. Emergency response and evacuation for the City is based on numerous access routes and bridges. The Specific Plan would not interfere emergency response plans or impede roadway access through removal of any streets. All construction activities would be required to be performed per the City's and LBFD's standards and regulations. For example, future development would be required to provide the necessary on- and offsite access and circulation for emergency vehicles and services during the construction and operation phases.

The proposed project, which consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall is subject to the City's development review and permitting process and is required to incorporate all applicable design and safety standards and regulations, as set forth by LBFD and in Chapter 18.48 (Fire Code) of the City's municipal code, to ensure that they do not interfere with the provision of local emergency services (e.g., provision of adequate access roads to accommodate emergency response vehicles, adequate numbers/locations of fire hydrants). Therefore, the proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the City of Long Beach or Los Angeles County's emergency response or evacuation plans. Project-related impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

*h) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to the urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?*

The SEASP PEIR found that the Project area is in a highly urbanized, built-out portion of the City and is outside of fire hazard severity zones designated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. The nearby cities of Signal Hill, Carson, and Seal Beach also are not zoned as fire hazard severity zones. The nearest high severity zones are in Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, and Palos Verdes Estate, approximately 13 miles west of the Project area (CAL FIRE 2012). The proposed project would not pose wildfire-related hazards to people or structures. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (5.9-5)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planner uses for which permits have been granted)? (5.9-3)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (5.9-2)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course if a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (5.9-1)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (5.9-1)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (5.9-5)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate map or other flood hazard delineation map? (5.9-4)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (5.9-4)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (5.9-6)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (5.9-7)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

The SEASP PEIR found that in order to evaluate impacts on the storm drain system, changes in surface water flows must be evaluated to determine the change in impervious surfaces. Based on the high existing impervious conditions in the development areas and the proposed change in land uses which are generally equal to or less than existing impervious conditions, Project runoff is not anticipated to increase over existing conditions. Table 5.9-4 compares the existing and proposed impervious conditions for the proposed land use designations and areas of change. As shown, buildout of the Project would reduce the amount of impervious surfaces by approximately four acres. Four of the five drainage improvements in the Master Plan are in public roadways. Installation of the four drainage improvements in roadways would disturb soil that has been previously disturbed by construction of the roadways and other utilities. However, since the project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall, disturbance to roadway soil is not anticipated. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planner uses for which permits have been granted)?*

The SEASP PEIR found that under the existing conditions, the Southeast Area Project area is entirely built out and is mostly impervious. During storm events, most runoff does not infiltrate and recharge groundwater. Under the proposed condition, the combination of enhanced landscaping, self-treating areas for water quality treatment, and permeable pavements for water efficiency are some examples of features that are required with new developments that would increase perviousness compared to existing conditions. Also, on-site storm drain systems would be upgraded to include water quality LID features which would increase infiltration compared to existing conditions. The Project area does not rely directly on on-site groundwater supply sources and therefore would have no impact on the local groundwater table. Impacts would be less than significant with the incorporation of Mitigation Measures

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

The SEASP PEIR found that under the existing conditions and proposed conditions, drainage patterns would largely be maintained and would utilize the existing drainage facilities within the public right of way. Flows generally drain southerly and westerly into the existing streets and are collected by a series of catch basins and storm drain facilities

owned and operated by the City and Los Angeles County Public Works. Ultimately the majority of flows discharge to water bodies subject to tidal influences (Marine Stadium, Alamitos Bay, Los Cerritos Channel) or the San Gabriel River. Such water bodies are not subject to substantial erosion or siltation based on their ability to receive large influxes of water while maintaining their channel stability. On-site storm drain systems would likely change with the individual project components but would still utilize the existing city and county facilities within the public right of way. Implementation of the project would not result in erosion or siltation on or off-site.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

- d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*

The SEASP PEIR found that in order to evaluate impacts on the storm drain system, changes in surface water flows must be evaluated to determine the change in impervious surfaces. Based on the high existing impervious conditions in the development areas and the proposed change in land uses which are generally equal to or less than existing impervious conditions, Project runoff is not anticipated to increase over existing conditions. Table 5.9-4 compares the existing and proposed impervious conditions for the proposed land use designations and areas of change. As shown, buildout of the Project would reduce the amount of impervious surfaces by approximately four acres. Four of the five drainage improvements in the Master Plan are in public roadways. Installation of the four drainage improvements in roadways would disturb soil that has been previously disturbed by construction of the roadways and other utilities. However, since the project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall, disturbance to roadway soil is not anticipated. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

- e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

The SEASP PEIR found that in order to evaluate impacts on the storm drain system, changes in surface water flows must be evaluated to determine the change in impervious surfaces. Based on the high existing impervious conditions in the development areas and the proposed change in land uses which are generally equal to or less than existing impervious conditions, Project runoff is not anticipated to increase over existing conditions. Table 5.9-4 compares the existing and proposed impervious conditions for the proposed land use designations and areas of change. As shown, buildout of the Project would reduce the amount of impervious surfaces by approximately four acres. Four of the five drainage improvements in the Master Plan are in public roadways. Installation of the four drainage improvements in roadways would disturb soil that has been previously disturbed by construction of the roadways and other utilities. However, since the project

consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall, disturbance to roadway soil is not anticipated. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

*f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

### Construction Phase

The SEASP PEIR found that construction activities related to the proposed project would potentially result in soil erosion and temporary adverse impacts to surface water quality from construction materials and wastes if left unregulated. Clearing, grading, excavation, and construction activities associated with the proposed project may impact water quality due to sheet erosion of exposed soils and subsequent deposition of sediment in local drainages. Grading activities, in particular, lead to exposed areas of loose soil, as well as sediment stockpiles, that are susceptible to uncontrolled sheet flow. Although erosion occurs naturally in the environment, primarily from weathering by water and wind, improperly managed construction activities can substantially accelerate erosion that are considered detrimental to the environment.

### *General Construction Permit*

Prior to the issuance of grading permits, project applicants are required to provide evidence that the development of projects with one acre or greater of soil disturbance shall comply with the most current GCP and associated local NPDES regulations to ensure that the potential for soil erosion is minimized on a project-by-project basis. In accordance with the updated GCP (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ), the following Permit Registration Documents are required to be submitted to the SWRCB prior to commencement of construction activities:

- Notice of Intent (NOI)
- Risk Assessment (Standard or Site-Specific)
- Particle Size Analysis (if site-specific risk assessment is performed)
- Site Map
- SWPPP
- Post-Construction Water Balance Calculator (not required – project is covered under the Long Beach MS4 permit Order No. R4-2014-0024)
- Active Treatment System (ATS) Design Documentation (if ATS is determined necessary)
- Annual Fee & Certification

The updated GCP, Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, uses a risk-based approach for controlling erosion and sediment discharges from construction sites since the rates of erosion and sedimentation can vary from site to site depending on factors such as duration of construction activities, climate, topography, soil condition, and proximity to receiving water bodies. The updated GCP identifies three levels of risk with differing



requirements, designated as Risk Levels 1, 2 and 3, with Risk Level 1 having the fewest permit requirements and Risk Level 3 having the most-stringent requirements. Since the proposed Project is the adoption of a Specific Plan in the City of Long Beach, a detailed, site-specific Risk Assessment cannot be performed at this time. However, since the Project area resides in a watershed considered to be a low-risk receiving water body, it is anticipated that construction projects subject to the GCP will not be greater than Risk Level 2.

### *Best Management Practices*

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

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

SWPPPs will require projects to plan BMPs for four general phases of construction: (1) grading and land development (e.g., mass grade & rough grade), (2) utility and road installation, (3) vertical construction, and (4) final stabilization and landscaping. Therefore, BMP implementation for new construction can be evaluated in this general context. Site specific details on individual BMPs would be dependent on the scope and breadth of each future project, which are not known at this time.

Both state and local regulations would effectively mitigate construction stormwater runoff impacts from the build-out of the Southeast Area Specific Plan. The City of Long Beach Municipal Code requires standard erosion control practices to be implemented for all construction within the City. Additionally, construction sites are required to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in accordance with the requirements of the Statewide General Construction Permit and are subject to the oversight of the LARWQCB. The SWPPP must include BMPs to reduce or eliminate erosion and sedimentation from soil disturbing activities, as well as proper materials and waste management. Implementation of these state and local requirements would effectively protect projects from violating any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements from construction activities.

### Operations Phase

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

### *Best Management Practices*

To help prevent long-term impacts associated with land use changes and in accordance with the requirements of the City of Long Beach and its MS4 permit (Order No. R4-2014-0024), new development and significant redevelopment projects must incorporate LID/site design and source control BMPs to address post-construction stormwater runoff management. In addition, projects that are identified as Priority Projects are required to implement site design/LID and source control BMPs applicable to their specific priority project categories, as well as implement treatment control BMPs where necessary. Selection of LID and additional treatment control BMPs is based on the pollutants of concern for the specific Project area and the BMP's ability to effectively treat those pollutants, in consideration of site conditions and constraints. Further, projects must develop a project-specific LID Design Plan that describes the menu of BMPs chosen for the project, as well as include operation and maintenance requirements for all structural and any treatment control BMPs.

Since the Southeast Area Project does not include a specific or detailed development plan, project-specific LID Design Plans would not be developed for the project at this time. Future project-specific reports, preliminary and/or final, would be prepared consistent with the prevailing terms and conditions of the City's LID Ordinance (Ordinance No. ORD-2013-0024) and LID BMP Design Manual (2013) at the time of project application. Moreover, LID and water quality treatment solutions prescribed in project-specific reports would be designed to support or enhance the regional BMPs and efforts implemented by the City as part of City-wide efforts to improve water quality.

### *LID Design Approach*

The overall approach to water quality treatment for the individual projects within the Southeast Area Project would include incorporation of site design/LID strategies and source control measures throughout the sites in a systematic manner that maximizes the use of LID features to provide treatment of stormwater and reduce runoff. In accordance with the MS4 Permit for the City of Long Beach, the use of LID features would be consistent with the prescribed hierarchy of treatment provided in the Permit: infiltration, evapotranspiration, harvest/reuse, and biotreatment. For those areas of the site where LID features are not feasible, treatment control BMPs utilizing biotreatment would be

used. Where applicable, LID features would be analyzed to demonstrate their ability to treat portions of the required design capture volume (DCV) and reduce the size of downstream on-site treatment control BMPs.

- Where feasible, LID features would be sized for water quality treatment credit according to Regional Board sizing criteria as defined in the 2014 MS4 Permit for either flow- based or volume-based BMPs. There must be a significant effort to integrate LID techniques within the internal development areas (site design objectives), thereby providing treatment of low-flow runoff directly at the source and runoff reduction of small (i.e., more frequent) storm event runoff (first-flush). In most instances, LID features would be sized by volume-based analyses to demonstrate compliance with the required design capture volume for the project.
- Detailed field investigations, drainage calculations, grading, and BMP sizing would occur during the detailed design phase and future project-specific LID Design Plan documentation.
- Where feasible, LID features would be designed to infiltrate and/or reuse treated runoff on-site in accordance with feasibility criteria as defined in the 2013 LID BMP Design Manual (City of Long Beach Development Services).
- For those areas of the project where infiltration is not recommended or acceptable and harvest/reuse landscaping demands are insufficient, biotreatment LID features would be designed to treat runoff and discharge controlled effluent flows to downstream receiving waters.

Unlike flood control measures that are designed to handle peak storm flows, LID BMPs and treatment control BMPs are designed to retain, filter or treat more frequent, low-flow runoff or the “first-flush” runoff from storm events. In accordance with the 2014 MS4 Permit for the City of Long Beach, the LID BMPs would be sized and designed to ensure on-site retention of the volume of runoff produced from a 24-hour 85th percentile storm event, as determined from the Los Angeles County’s 85th Percentile Precipitation Map.12 This is termed the “design capture volume”, or DCV. The 85th Percentile for the northern half of the Southeast Area Project is 0.7 inch; the 85th Percentile event for the southern half of the Project area is 0.6 inch. The City’s LID BMP Design Manual provides design criteria, hydrologic methods and calculations for combining use of infiltration, retention, and biofiltration BMPs to meet on-site volume retention requirements.

#### *Other Water Quality Opportunities*

LID BMPs could be used within the mixed-use land uses on-site. Mixed use projects tend to be higher density with limited at grade surface parking and often include parking structures that may include subterranean parking facilities. LID BMPs could still be used within the common areas, landscape perimeters and subterranean locations. For example, a bioswale within the Whole Foods parking lot along Pacific Coast Highway was

incorporated to treat parking lot surface waters. Similar facilities could be incorporated within future site-specific projects.

Incorporating stormwater treatment within the proposed landscaping (i.e. biofiltration flow through planter) would be potentially feasible based upon the proposed grading. In addition, proprietary biotreatment BMPs designed at the allowable flow-through rates may be suitable for certain projects or specific locations within projects. A centralized harvest and use cistern to capture rain water and reuse for landscaping and internal building demands (toilet flushing and laundry services) would also be an option. With this option, recent technology has increased the viability of gray water systems which collect shower and sink water and then treat and disinfect to reusable standards. Gray water systems could be combined with stormwater harvest and reuse systems to provide sustainable solutions to reducing potable water usage by reusing water more than once. Lastly, in certain area of the Project area, infiltration into deeper depths below the upper clay soils may be possible. However, the presence of shallow groundwater lenses would prohibit infiltration-based solutions.

Opportunities also exist within the public right of way for those streets that may undergo re-design. Parkway planters provide opportunities for stormwater treatment and proprietary based biotreatment BMPs for roadway drainage.

Projects developed in conformance with the Specific Plan would be required to comply with the California Trash TMDL expected to take effect in July 2016. These requirements include the installation and maintenance of trash screening devices at all public curb inlets, grate inlets, and catch basin inlets. The trash screening devices must be approved by the local agency and be consistent with the minimum standards of the Trash TMDL.

The individual development and redevelopment projects undertaken in conformance with the Specific Plan would effectively retain or treat the 85th percentile 24-hour stormwater runoff for pollutants prior to discharge off their property. As more and more properties within the Southeast Area Specific Plan area undergo redevelopment as part of the Specific Plan build-out, properties not containing any water quality BMPs would be replaced with projects incorporating LID BMPs. Therefore, long-term surface water quality of runoff from the Southeast Area Specific Plan area would be expected to improve over existing conditions as more LID BMPs are implemented with the redevelopment projects throughout the Project. This would be considered an overall beneficial effect of the Project.

#### ***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

- g) Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.*
- h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.*

The proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. It would not change land use designations within the part of SEASP within 100-year flood zones and would not change the types or intensities of land uses permitted in those areas. Therefore, no impact would occur.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

- i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?*

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

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

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

- j) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.*

The SEASP PEIR found that a development project could exacerbate existing tsunami flood hazard if, for instance, it removed a barrier to coastal flooding, or if it lowered the elevation of a site in or next to an existing tsunami flood zone. The proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. Therefore, removal of coastal flood barriers is not anticipated. Furthermore, buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would not remove seawalls or other barriers to coastal flooding. Considering the low elevation on much of the site and the shallow groundwater table, it is not expected that development projects would propose habitable land uses at lower elevations than the existing. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Land Use / Planning</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Physically divide an established community?	Less Than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Less Than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Less Than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Would the project physically divide an established community?*

The SEASP PEIR found that the existing community character of the Project area consists of distinct neighborhoods, many of which are gated and separated from commercial centers. These areas are separate from the wetland and industrial uses in the eastern portion of the Project area. One of the main goals of the proposed Specific Plan is to identify opportunity areas for better urban design and placemaking to plan for a more cohesive sense of place in the Project area. Implementation of the project would occur within the confines of the Project area and would not introduce roadways or other infrastructure improvements that would bisect or transect the surrounding communities. The proposed project, which consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall, would be compatible with and similar to the surrounding land uses, both on the project site and off-site. No impacts related to division of established communities would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

*b) Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

The SEASP PEIR found that the proposed project would be consistent with all applicable land use plans, policies and regulations pertaining to the General Plan and the Local Coastal Program. The project consists of the construction to two new commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within a fully developed commercial center. The project is not anticipated to alter consistency of the project site with applicable regulations. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

- c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

The SEASP PEIR found that The Project area is not in the planning area of a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is necessary

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Mineral Resources</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (5.11-1)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (5.11-1)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) <i>Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</i>			
b) <i>Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</i>			
The SEASP PEIR found that no oil extraction land uses, or other mineral resource recovery sites currently exist within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources are anticipated and further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.			
<b>NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR</b>			



	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Noise</b>			
-- Would the Project result in:			
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (5.12-3, 5.12-4)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (5.12-2)	Less than significant after mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (5.12-1, 5.12-3, 5.12-4)	Significant and unavoidable (even after mitigation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Not addressed in PEIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Not addressed in PEIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Noise</b>			
-- Would the Project result in:			
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to noise levels?	Not addressed in PEIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a) *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

The SEASP PEIR found that the proposed project would cause increases in traffic along local roadways. Traffic noise levels were estimated using the FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model. Traffic volumes for existing and 2035 conditions, without and with the Project, were obtained from the traffic impact analysis prepared by Fehr & Peers (see Appendix J). The FHWA model predicts noise levels through a series of adjustments to a reference sound level. These adjustments account for distances from the roadway, traffic flows, vehicle speeds, car/truck mix, length of exposed roadway, and road width. The distances to the 70, 65, and 60 CNEL contours for selected roadway segments in the vicinity of the Project area are included in Appendix I. A significant impact could occur if the project would result in an increase of 5 dBA although the resulting noise level is within the objectives of the City's General Plan (e.g., 65 dBA CNEL at a noise-sensitive location), or 3 dBA if the resulting level meets or exceeds those objectives.

The SEASP PEIR also found that no roadway segments would result in an increase greater than 5 dBA or experience increases greater than 3 dBA that result in noise levels greater than 65 dBA CNEL. Therefore, traffic noise increases for existing plus Project conditions would be less than significant. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

#### ***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

- a) *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

### Construction Vibration Impacts

The SEASP PEIR found that construction operations can generate varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the construction procedures and equipment. Operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish with distance from the source. The effect on buildings in the vicinity of the construction site varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and receptor-building construction. The results from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight structural damage at the highest levels. Vibration from construction activities rarely reaches the levels that can damage structures but can achieve the audible and perceptible ranges in buildings close to the construction site. Table 5.12-11, Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment, lists vibration levels for construction equipment. However, groundborne vibration is almost never annoying to people who are outdoors, so it is usually evaluated in terms of indoor receivers (FTA 2006). Construction details and equipment for individual development projects that would be accommodated by the proposed Project are not known at this time. Vibration impacts may occur from construction equipment associated with development in accordance with the implementation of the proposed Project. Therefore, construction vibration impacts are considered significant.

### Roadway-Related Vibration Impacts

Operation of new commercial land uses could generate additional truck trips that could potentially generate various levels of vibration along the traveled roadways. Additionally, truck trips could be generated during construction of the proposed project. Caltrans has studied the effects of propagation of vehicle vibration on sensitive land uses and notes that “heavy trucks, and quite frequently buses, generate the highest earth borne vibrations of normal traffic” (2002). Caltrans further notes that the highest traffic-generated vibrations are along freeways and state routes. Their study finds that “vibrations measured on freeway shoulders (five meters from the centerline of the nearest lane) have never exceeded 0.08 inches per second, with the worst combinations of heavy trucks. This level coincides with the maximum recommended safe level for ruins and ancient monuments (and historic buildings)” (2002). Typically, trucks do not generate high levels of vibration because they travel on rubber wheels and do not have vertical movement, which generates ground vibration (Caltrans 2002). Therefore, roadway routes within the Project area are not expected to generate excessive vibration, and traffic-induced vibration levels would be less than significant, with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure N-2.

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

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

- b) Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

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

Construction of the proposed project would temporarily increase the ambient noise environment and would have the potential to affect noise-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of that project. Per Section 8.80.202 (Construction Activity-Noise Regulations) of the City's municipal code, construction activities are prohibited from 7:00 PM to 7:00 AM Mondays through Fridays and before 9:00 AM and after 6:00 PM on Saturdays. Construction is prohibited on Sundays unless a permit has been issued. Significant noise impacts may occur from operation of heavy earthmoving equipment and truck hauling that would occur with construction of individual development projects. Construction noise levels depend on the specific locations, site plans, and construction details of individual development projects, which are not known at this time. Construction-related noise would be localized and would occur intermittently for varying periods of time. Because these construction activities may occur near noise-sensitive receptors and noise disturbances may occur for prolonged periods of time (depending on the project type), construction noise impacts associated with the proposed project are considered significant. Mitigation Measure Measure N-1 was included to apply project-level development review:

**Mitigation Measure N-1** - Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, and/or building permits for development projects accommodated by the Southeast Area Specific Plan, a note shall be provided on development plans indicating that ongoing during grading, demolition, and construction, the property owner/developer shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-related noise:

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

The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (N-1) and conditions of approval, upon commencement of and during grading and construction activities for the proposed project.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

- c) Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

**NOT ADDRESSED IN THE SEASP PEIR**

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*
- e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working the project area to excessive noise levels?*

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

There are no private air strips adjacent to or within the vicinity of the Project area. The closest private heliport is the Kilroy AC8-Long Beach Heliport near the Long Beach Municipal Airport, approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the Project area. Other private heliports in the City are located toward downtown Long Beach and the Port of Long Beach and include the Long Beach Memorial Medical Center Heliport, St. Mary Medical Center Heliport, Queen Mary Heliport, Queensway Bay Heliport, and NAA Long Beach Port Heliport (Airnav.com 2014). Over congested areas, helicopters are required to maintain an altitude of at least 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within 2,000 feet of the aircraft, except as needed for takeoff and landing (Code of Federal Regulations Title 14 § 91.119). Additionally, helicopter takeoffs and landings at these private heliports are sporadic and far enough from the Project area that they would not pose a hazard to future residents and workers of the proposed Project. Therefore, Project development would not cause any hazards related to aircraft operating to or from private airstrips or heliports, and no mitigation measures are necessary. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Population and Housing</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (5.13-1)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (5.13-2)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

The SEASP PEIR found that under the adoption of the SEASP, the nine-acre area outside the proposed Specific Plan would be extracted from the existing Southeast Area Development Improvement Plan (PD-1) zone and converted to conventional zoning (Single-Family Residential). Despite these zoning designation revisions that would be undertaken, no physical change (e.g., additional development intensity, redevelopment) would be expected to occur within this area and all existing uses (which include 39 units and 16,693 square feet of public use) would be expected to remain. The proposed project consists of the construction of two new commercial buildings of 7,000 square feet and 5,000 square feet, and the addition of 1,007 square feet to an existing building. Therefore, no population, housing or employment impacts would be anticipated to occur. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

- b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*
- c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

The proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. Therefore, the displacement of existing housing or people is not anticipated. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area:        Public Services</b>			
-- Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:			
a) Fire protection? (5.14-1)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection? (5.14-2)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools? (5.14-3)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	Not addressed in PEIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Libraries? (5.14-4)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection?*



The SEASP PEIR found that implementation of the Southeast Area Specific Plan would increase the overall demand on fire protection and emergency services in the City. Buildout would add net increases of about 5,439 housing units, 8,648 residents, 573,576 square feet of nonresidential land uses, and 560 employees to the Project area. This growth in accordance with the Specific Plan is expected to create the typical range of fire and emergency service calls, and would increase the need for new fire facilities, apparatus, and personnel in order to maintain adequate response times. LBFD's costs to maintain equipment and apparatus, and to train and equip personnel, would also increase. However, considering the existing firefighting resources available in the City, implementation of the Specific Plan is not expected to result in impacts on fire protection and emergency services. The increase in potential services needed would not require the significant expansion or construction of a new fire station. Furthermore, the proposed project consists of... Therefore, no substantial adverse physical impacts are anticipated. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

*b) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?*

The SEASP PEIR found that although the proposed project would incrementally increase demands on the Long Beach Police Department, those increased demands would not require the construction of new police protection facilities.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

*c) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools?*

The SEASP PEIR found that payment of required school impact fees prior to building permit issuance would avoid a significant impact to school services associated with the proposed project, the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

*d) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant*

*environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks?*

**NOT ADDRESSED IN THE SEASP PEIR**

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

*e) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for libraries?*

The SEASP PEIR found that the Long Beach Public Library does not expect that Specific Plan buildout would create a need for a new library facility, let alone the proposed project, which consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Recreation</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (5.15-1)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (5.15-2)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

The SEASP PEIR found that buildout of the Specific Plan would allow the development of up to 5,439 additional units and introduce 8,648 additional residents into the Project area (and City) compared to existing conditions. These additional permanent residents could lead to an increase in demand for existing City parks and recreational facilities. However, the proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. The project will not add permanent residents to the City of Long Beach and therefore, would not increase the use of existing neighborhood facilities.

#### **NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

*b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

The project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. Therefore, it does not include recreational facilities or require

the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Transportation/Traffic</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) 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. (5.16-1, 5.16-2)	Significant and unavoidable (even after mitigation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. (5.16-3)	Significant and unavoidable (even after mitigation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (5.16-7)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (5.16-4)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (5.16-5)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Transportation/Traffic</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. (5.16-6)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) <i>Would the project 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?</i>			

The SEASP PEIR found that the proposed Project would generate additional vehicular travel in the study area. Given the mixed-use nature of the SEASP. Mitigation Measures TRAF-1, TRAF-2, and TRAF-3 were included to apply project-level development review:

**Mitigation Measure TRAF-1** - As the system's capacity is reached, it will become important to manage the street system in a more efficient and coordinated manner. Improvements to the Project area transportation system are proposed as part of the overall Downtown development, including improvements that have been required of other area projects previously approved by the City. Therefore, the mitigation focuses on improvements that would not require significant additional rights-of-way and are achievable within the life of the Plan. There are five proposed mitigation measures for the SEASP, as follows:

**Mitigation Measure TRAF-2** - Prior to issuance of occupancy permits for development projects that would be accommodated by the SEASP, project applicants/developers shall make fair-share payments to the City of Long Beach toward construction of the traffic improvements listed below. The following traffic improvements and facilities are necessary to mitigate impacts of the SEASP and shall be included in the City's fee mechanism(s):

### **Existing with Project Improvements**

- **Studebaker Road & SR-22 Westbound Ramps:** Construct a spiral striped roundabout with two circulating lanes, with a southbound slip (bypass) lane. The southbound approach would be striped with two through lanes and one shared through-left turn lane; the westbound approach would have two left turn lanes and one right turn slip lane; and the northbound approach would have two through lanes and one right turn slip lane. This measure would be funded through the City of Long Beach Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and fair-share contributions from area developments. Alternatively, the intersection could remain signalized with the following improvements:
  - Modify the westbound approach from two left turn lanes and one right turn lane, to three left turn lanes and one right turn lane.
  - Modify the southbound approach from one left turn lane and one through lane, to one left turn lane and three through lanes.
  - Optimize the AM and PM signal cycle lengths and splits.
- **Shopkeeper Road & 2nd Street:** This intersection would require the following improvements:
  - Modify the northbound approach from one shared through-left turn lane and one right turn lane, to one shared through-left turn lane and two right turn lanes.
  - Modify the westbound approach from one left turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane, to two left turn lanes, two through lanes, and one shared through right turn lane.

### **Cumulative Year (2035) With Project Improvements**

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

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

- Modify the westbound approach from two left turn lanes and one right turn lane, to three left turn lanes and one right turn lane.
- Modify the northbound approach from one through lane and one shared through-right turn lane, to two through lanes and one shared through-right turn lane.
- Modify the southbound approach from one left turn lane and one through lane, to one left turn lane and three through lanes.

- Optimize the AM and PM signal cycle lengths and splits.
- **Marina Drive & 2nd Street:** This intersection would require the following improvements:
  - Modify the northbound approach from one left turn lane, one shared through-left turn lane, one through lane, and one right turn lane, to two left turn lanes, one through lane, and one right turn lane.
  - Modify the southbound approach from one left turn lane, one shared through-left turn lane, and one right turn lane, to two left turn lanes, one through lane, and one right turn lane.
  - Modify the westbound approach from one left turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane, to two left turn lanes, two through lanes, and one shared through right turn lane.
  - **Shopkeeper Road & 2nd Street:** This intersection would require the following improvements:
    - Modify the westbound approach from one left turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane, to two left turn lanes, two through lanes, and one shared through right turn lane.
    - Modify the eastbound approach from one left turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane, to one left turn lane, three through lanes, and one right turn lane.
- **PCH & Studebaker Road:** This intersection would require the following improvements:
  - Modify the southbound approach from one left turn lane, two through lanes, one right turn lane, and one right turn lane, to one left turn lane, three through lanes, one right turn lane.
  - Optimization of the PM signal cycle lengths and splits.

**Mitigation Measure TRAF-3** - Prior to issuance of occupancy permits for development projects that would be accommodated by the SEASP, project applicants/developers shall make fair-share payments to the City of Seal Beach toward construction of the traffic improvement listed below.

- **Seal Beach Boulevard & 2nd Street/Westminster Boulevard:** Modify the northbound approach from having one left turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through-right turn lane, to having one left turn lane, three through lanes, and one right turn lane.

The impact of project-related trip generation effecting levels of service for the existing area roadway system would be reduced by the following alternatives, however, no alternative would reduce this impact to a less than significant level:



- No Project/Adopted PD-1 (SEADIP)
- No Project/No Development
- Reduced Intensity

Only the “No Project/No Development” alternative would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The developer will be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures (TRAF-1, TRAF-2, TRAF-3) and conditions of approval, upon submission of construction documents and during construction activities for the proposed project.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

- b) Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

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

- Pacific Coast Highway & 7th Street
- Pacific Coast Highway & 2nd Street According to the CMP Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines developed by Metro, a traffic impact analysis is required if a proposed project would add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to a CMP intersection, including freeway on- or off-ramps. For CMP-designated intersections, the acceptable LOS is E.

The SEASP PEIR found that no feasible mitigation is available for the impact of conflicting with an applicable congestion management plan. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

- c) Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

The Long Beach Municipal Airport is approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the Project area. The Project area is not within the airport's land use plan and would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircrafts flying to and from Long Beach Municipal Airport. The proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No impacts are anticipated. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

- d) *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

The SEASP PEIR found that at Project completion (buildout of SEASP), improvements to the circulation network within the SEASP area would improve vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle mobility. Improvements would consist of roadway connections, additional lanes at intersections, and new bicycle lanes and sidewalks (also see PDF-4 and PDF-5, below). The City of Long Beach and Long Beach Fire Department (LBFD) have adopted roadway design standards that preclude the construction of any unsafe design features. Standards for provision of safe road and circulation improvements are also outlined in the Specific Plan. The proposed project, which consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall, would be required to adhere to the City's Standard Engineering Plans and LBFD's design standards, as well as those outlined in the Specific Plan, which would be imposed during the building plan check and development review process. Compliance with these established and proposed design standards would ensure that hazards due to design features would not occur. No mitigation measures are necessary.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

- e) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

The proposed project consists of the construction of two commercial buildings of 7,000 square-feet and 5,000 square-feet, and the addition of 1,007 square-feet to an existing building within the Marina Pacifica Mall. The project is subject to the review and approval by the City, LBFD, and LBPB prior to building permits and certificates of occupancy. Therefore, impacts on emergency access would be less than significant.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

- f) *Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?*

The SEASP PEIR found that the mobility and streetscape plan for SEASP is guided by the City's mobility element and incorporates several complete street concepts to promote bicycle and pedestrian travel. The Specific Plan would provide an equitable method of vehicular, public transit, pedestrian, and bicycle access for development of the area. The Specific Plan would improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities and infrastructure throughout the Project area to promote active and alternative modes of transportation. Additionally, it would not create a substantial increase in transit ridership that could decrease the performance or safety of the system. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

***NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR***

	SEASP PEIR Determination	Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in SEASP PEIR	No Impact/ No Change to SEASP PEIR
<b>Impact Area: Utilities and Service Systems</b>			
-- Would the Project:			
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (5.17-2)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (5.17-1, 5.17-3)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have sufficient water supplies to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and new and/or expanded entitlements would be needed? (5.17-3)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) 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? (5.17-2)	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Substantially increase demand on energy or require the construction of new or the expansion of existing	Less than significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

facilities, the construction of which  
could cause significant  
environmental effect?

- a) *Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

The SEASP PEIR found that both wastewater treatment plants serving the Project have adequate capacity to treat the increase in sewer generation associated with the proposed Project. There are no capacity issues and no planned capital improvements to the existing water system in the Project area.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

- b) *Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*
- c) *Would the project have sufficient water supplies to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and new and/or expanded entitlements would be needed?*

The SEASP PEIR found that Specific Plan buildout is expected to involve construction of new water laterals serving individual development or redevelopment projects built pursuant to the proposed Specific Plan. The impacts of construction of the laterals would be part of the impacts of construction of the affected projects. Further study of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

- d) *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 SEASP PEIR found that both wastewater treatment plants serving the Project have adequate capacity to treat the increase in sewer generation associated with the proposed Project. There are no capacity issues and no planned capital improvements to the existing water system in the Project area.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

- e) *Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*

The SEASP PEIR found that project buildout would not require construction of new or expanded solid waste disposal, recycling, or transformation facilities. Impacts on solid waste disposal capacity would be less than significant.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

*f) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

*The SEASP PEIR found that individual projects would be required to comply with the provisions of the 2010 Green Building Standards Code, which outlines requirements for construction waste reduction, material selection, and natural resource conservation. Therefore, no significant impacts regarding solid waste would occur.*

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**

*g) Substantially increase demand on energy or require the construction of new or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effect?*

*h) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

The SEASP PEIR found that the areas considered for cumulative impacts are SCE's service area for electricity, and the City of Long Beach for natural gas. Other cumulative development projects in accordance with the Long Beach General Plan would result in net increases in residential units and nonresidential square feet in each service area. However, Long Beach is a nearly built-out urbanized city; and much of the land in SCE's service area that is designated in City or Los Angeles County general plans for development is already developed. Therefore, many or most of the other cumulative development projects in the respective service areas would be redevelopment projects. Redevelopment projects would be required to achieve far more rigorous energy efficiency standards than the pre-existing developments on the affected sites. Therefore, while total numbers of residential units and nonresidential square feet in each service area would increase, energy efficiency per residential unit or square foot is expected to increase. SCE and the City of Long Beach Gas and Oil Department each forecast that they will have adequate electricity and gas supplies, respectively, to meet demands within their service areas. Cumulative development projects would not combine with the development that would occur under the proposed Project to result in significant cumulative impacts and impacts on electricity and gas supplies would not be cumulatively considerable.

**NO IMPACT NOT IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS EIR**