EXHIBIT C

City of Long Beach
Mobility Element

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

ND 01-11

Prepared by:

City of Long Beach
Department of Development Services
Planning Bureau

INITIAL STUDY

Project Title:
City of Long Beach Mobility Element

Lead agency name and address:
Long Beach Planning Commission
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Contact person and phone number:
Craig Chalfant
(562) 570-6368

Project location:
City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles, California

Project Sponsor's name and contact information:
City of Long Beach, Long Beach Development Services
c/o Ira Brown
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802
(562) 570-5972

General Plan:
The Mobility Element is one of the State mandated Elements of the City's General Plan.

Zoning:
The Mobility Element involves all zoning districts in the City of Long Beach.

Project Description:

The Mobility Element focuses on the circulation component of the City of Long Beach General Plan and will replace the adopted 1991 Transportation Element. Compared to the current Transportation Element, the proposed update places more emphasis on pedestrian, bicycling and public transit options, and transformative infrastructure projects to spur community revitalization. The Mobility Element update is being prepared in compliance with the 2008 Complete Streets Act (Assembly Bill 1358), which mandates that circulation elements to include concepts for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets and highways including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, children, person with disabilities, seniors, movers of commercial goods and user of public transportation.

In compliance with the State's General Plan Guidelines, this Mobility Element addresses the following topics:

- The movement of people by walking, bicycling, public transit, automobiles, wheelchair, private transportation services, boats and cruise ships, airplanes, and helicopters.
- The movement of goods by cargo ships, port facilities, rail, trucks, and airplanes.
- The movement of resources, including energy resources (electricity, natural gas, and crude oil), water resources (water, wastewater, and stormwater), and communication resources (telephone, cellular phone, internet, fiber optics and cable).
- The City's efforts to achieve greater energy independence and adoption of renewable energy.

The end result of this Mobility Element would be an efficient, balanced, and multimodal citywide mobility network. The development of a citywide Complete Streets system prioritizes modal enhancements for particular major streets in mode-specific enhanced networks that will improve the overall transportation system. The Context Sensitive Street Classification system includes Pedestrian Priority Areas, Bicycle Plan, Transit-Priority Streets, Opportunity for Street Character Change, Parking Impacted Areas and Designated Truck Routes. Moreover, this Mobility Element lists a total of 51 possible Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects and 57 implementation measures. The overall intent of this Mobility Element is to improve traffic circulation patterns as well as increase opportunities for multi-modal forms of transportation.

The primary goals of this Mobility Element are to:

1) Create an efficient, balanced, and multimodal mobility network;
2) Maintain and enhance air, ground, and water transportation capacity; and
3) Lead the region by example with innovative and experimental practices.

To create an efficient, balanced, and multimodal mobility network, the City plans to:

- Establish a network of complete streets and prioritized travel corridors for different modes of transportation.
- Reconfigure streets to emphasize modal priorities.
- Strategically improve congested intersections and corridors.
- Establish a more flexible level of service approach to traffic analysis and improvements.
- Reduce the environmental impacts of the transportation system.
- Manage the supply of parking.

To maintain and enhance air, ground, and water transportation capacity, the City plans to:

- Promote general and commercial aviation facilities with convenient ground transportation access.
- Provide attractive marinas and marine terminals that encourage people to travel to and from Long Beach by private boats and yachts, and commercial charter ships and cruises.

- Increase use of private transportation services between airports, hotels, and local and regional destinations.

To lead the region by example with innovative and experimental practices, the City plans to:

- Be a leader in regional cooperation on transportation issues.
- Adapt mobility strategies and programs based on new concepts and technologies that reduce environmental impacts and increase the quality of life.
- Be a leading collaborator on transportation issues related to the regional mobility of goods.
- Provide for the efficient, clean, and safe movement of goods to support commerce and industry.
- Reduce the air quality impacts of freight transportation.
- Mitigate the impacts of increased freight transportation.
- Provide a safe and secure network of oil and natural gas pipelines.
- Promote an electrical utility system that is less dependent on regional power plants and embraces local energy development through the use of solar and wind technologies.
- Promote well-maintained water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure systems that serve the demands of existing and future residents and businesses while mitigating environmental impacts.
- Provide for a robust telecommunication system that meets the needs of residents and businesses, promotes economic development, and encourages telecommuting.

The new mobility element is expected to result in increased options for mobility; less congestion and greenhouse gas emissions; more walkable communities, and fewer travel barriers for active transportation and those who cannot drive such as children and people with disabilities. In addition, part of this balanced mobility network will be a reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a result of additional pedestrian, transit, and other non-motorized vehicle trips. The project is considered consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Future implementation of the Mobility Element will be done within the City's existing mobility network. The Mobility Element does not propose to add any new rights of way, significantly widen any existing rights of way, or close any existing streets. None of the proposed road system improvements would require that existing land uses be displaced, rezoned or obtained through eminent domain. Finally, physical improvements associated with the Mobility Element cannot be implemented without further review. Each future project will be subject to environmental review consistent with requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) at such time it is proposed for consideration.

Surrounding land uses and settings:

The City of Long Beach is adjacent to the following municipalities: City of Los Angeles (Wilmington, Port of Los Angeles), Carson, Compton, Paramount, Bellflower, Lakewood, Hawaiian Gardens, Cypress, Los Alamitos and Seal Beach. It is also adjacent to the unincorporated communities of Rancho Dominguez and Rossmoor. In addition, the City of Signal Hill is completed surrounded by the City of Long Beach. See Exhibit A.

Public agencies whose approval is required:

Long Beach Planning Commission (adopt Negative Declaration, recommend City Council approve Mobility Element)
Long Beach City Council (approve Mobility Element)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages:

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Population & Mobility
☐ Agricultural Resources	☐ Hydrology & Water Quality	☐ Public Services
☐ Air Quality	☐ Land Use & Planning	☐ Recreation
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Transportation & Traffic
☐ Cultural Resources	☐ National Pollution Discharge Elimination System	☐ Utilities & Service Systems
☐ Geology & Soils	☐ Noise	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIAVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Craig Chalfant
Planner

5/2/13
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are supported adequately by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration; Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analysis," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration (per Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effect were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less that Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the check list references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) The explanation of each issue should identify:

   a) The significance criteria or threshold. If any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

I. AESTHETICS

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The proposed Mobility Element update would not result in significant adverse effects to any scenic vistas or public views of scenic vistas. The City topography is relatively flat, with scenic vistas of the ocean to the south and Palos Verdes to the west. In addition, distant views of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains to the north as well as the Santa Ana Mountains to the east are occasionally available to the public on days of clear visibility (primarily during the winter months).

To achieve the goals and advance the policies related to the mobility of people that are set forth in this Mobility Element, the City of Long Beach will implement multiple-pronged initiatives through the Capital Improvement Program projects and implementation measures listed in this Element. In general, the Mobility Element would not create significant visual obstructions to local scenic resources. This Element would not encourage or propose any development of sufficient height and mass to partially obstruct some scenic views from the immediately adjacent properties.

This Mobility Element lists a total of 51 possible Capital Improvement Program projects and 57 implementation measures. Since the details of Capital Improvement Program projects have yet to be defined, full environmental analysis of these projects cannot be done at this time. All future improvement projects and implementation measures related to changes or improvements in any of the City's modes of transportation listed in the Mobility Element will be subject to separate environmental review in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, no further analysis of this environmental issue is necessary.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

There are no State scenic highways located within the City. No scenic resources, trees or rock outcroppings would be damaged as a result of Mobility Element implementation. The Mobility Element builds upon the other General

Plan chapters, including the Conservation Element, and the policies and programs set forth in this Mobility Element would be consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the entire General Plan. There would therefore be no impact to any natural scenic resource and no further analysis is required.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Please see I.a. and b. above for discussion.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

All future improvement projects would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, including Long Beach Municipal Code Chapter 9.37 (Long Beach Nuisance Code). Since the Mobility Element would not directly or indirectly create any adverse light or glare impacts, no further analysis is required.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a. Would the project 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

c. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

For II. a., b. and c. - There are no agricultural zones within the City of Long Beach, which is a fully urbanized community that has been built upon for over half a century. The Mobility Element would have no effect upon agricultural resources within the City of Long Beach or any other neighboring city or county.

III. AIR QUALITY

The South Coast Air Basin is subject to some of the worst air pollution in the nation, attributable to its topography, climate, meteorological conditions, large population base, and dispersed urban land use patterns.

Air quality conditions are affected by the rate and location of pollutant emissions and by climatic conditions that influence the movement and dispersion of pollutants. Atmospheric forces such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients, along with local and regional topography, determine how air pollutant emissions affect air quality.

The South Coast Air Basin has a limited capability to disperse air contaminants because of its low wind speeds and persistent temperature inversions. In the Long Beach area, predominantly daily winds consist of morning onshore airflow from the southwest at a mean speed of 7.3 miles per hour and afternoon and evening offshore airflow from the northwest at 0.2 to 4.7 miles per hour with little variability between seasons. Summer wind speeds average slightly higher than winter wind speeds. The prevailing winds carry air contaminants northward and then eastward over Whittier, Covina, Pomona and Riverside.

The majority of pollutants found in the Los Angeles County atmosphere originate from automobile exhausts as unburned hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen and other materials. Of the five major pollutant types (carbon monoxide, nitrogen

oxides, reactive organic gases, sulfur oxides, and particulates), only sulfur oxide emissions are produced mostly by sources other than automobile exhaust.

a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element would be consistent with all chapters of the Long Beach General Plan, including the Air Quality Element. In addition, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the subregion in which it is located, it is consistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategies specified in the AQMP. Since the Mobility Element does not propose any specific developments or growth inducing projects that would conflict with the SCAG growth forecasts, it would be consistent with the AQMP and therefore no further analysis is required.

b. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Actions contained in the Mobility Element would not significantly lower air quality standards or contribute to an air quality violation. The Mobility Element is a policy level to have a positive affect on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. Moreover, future discretionary projects would be reviewed on a project-specific basis consistent with CEQA and the General. Therefore, the Mobility Element impact on air quality will be less then significant.

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)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Please see III.a. and b. above for discussion.

d. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The CEQA Air Quality Handbook defines sensitive receptors as children, athletes, elderly and sick individuals that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. Facilities that serve various types of sensitive receptors, including, schools, hospitals, and senior care centers, are located throughout the City. Please see Sections III.a. and b. above for further discussion.

e. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plans, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. Potential sources of odors during construction include use of architectural coatings and solvents, and diesel-powered construction equipment. SCAQMD Rule 1113 limits the amount of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from architectural coatings and solvents, which lowers odorous emissions.

The improvement projects and implementation measures listed in the Mobility Element would not result in any new odors or intensification of odors beyond those typically associated with construction activities or transportation network maintenance and improvements (i.e. street re-paving). All future projects will be subject to separate environmental review in accordance with the CEQA. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

f. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☒ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

Future infrastructure improvement projects could generate some emission of greenhouse gases during both project construction, primarily through construction vehicle and equipment exhaust emissions, and operations, primarily through passenger vehicle emissions. However, all future project proposals will be subject to separate environmental review in accordance with the provisions of CEQA. The Mobility Element would not result in any new, ongoing sources of greenhouse gas emissions. Please also see III.a. through e. above for discussion. Therefore, contributions to greenhouse gas emissions of global climate change would be less than significant.

g. Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

See Section III.f. above for discussion. The Mobility Element would not establish any new plans, policies or regulations that would conflict with any federal, State of local plans, policies or regulations intended to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This Mobility Element will conform to the California climate change goals as stipulated in AB32 and SB375.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a. Would the project 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

Wildlife habitats within the City are generally limited to parks, nature preserves, and water body areas. The Mobility Element is a policy document that does not promote activities that would remove or impact any existing or planned wildlife habitats. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Future transportation mode improvements consistent with the Mobility Element would occur in established urbanized areas and would not remove or impact any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. No further environmental analysis is required.

c. Would the project 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Future improvements consistent with the Mobility Element would occur in established urbanized areas and would not promote or involve alteration of any protected wetland areas. No further environmental analysis is required.

d. Would the project 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Future improvements consistent with the Mobility Element would occur in established urbanized areas and would not alter or adversely impact any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, corridors or nursery sites. No further environmental analysis is required.

e. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element is a policy document encouraging maintenance and improvement of all modes of transportation in the City. Implementation of the Mobility Element would be consistent with the General Plan and in conformity with all local policies and regulations. It would not alter or eliminate any existing or future policy or ordinance protecting biological resources. No further environmental analysis is required.

f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element is unrelated to habitat conservation and would not have any adverse effects on any existing or future habitat conservation plans. The Mobility Element would be consistent with all other chapters of the General Plan, including the Conservation Element and the Open Space & Recreation Element. Please see Sections IV.a. through e. above for further discussion.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Evidence indicates that primitive peoples inhabited portions of the City as early as 5,000 to 2,000 B.C. Much of the remains and artifacts of these ancient peoples were destroyed during the first century of the City's development. The remaining archaeological sites are located predominantly in the southeast sector of the City.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The City of Long Beach is an urbanized community and nearly all properties within the City (with the exception of areas such as protected park lands) have been previously disturbed and/or developed. While this Mobility Element lists a total of 51 Capital Improvement Program projects and 57 implementation

measures, the exact timing and specific components of these and other possible transportation improvement projects has not yet been determined. The Mobility Element is a policy document that would not promote, encourage or enable projects or activities that could remove, degrade or in any way adversely impact local historic resources. Since the details of Capital Improvement Program projects have yet to be defined, full environmental analysis of these projects cannot be done at this time. Future project proposals consistent with the Mobility Element will be subject to separate environmental review in accordance with CEQA. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section §15064.5?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element does not identify any specific construction activities involving extensive excavation, and therefore would not be anticipated to affect or destroy any archaeological resources due its geographic location. Future project proposals consistent with the Mobility Element will be subject to separate environmental review in accordance with CEQA. Please see Section V.a. above for further discussion.

c. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element does not propose any projects that would be anticipated to result in extensive excavation that could adversely impact any paleontological resources or geologic features. Please see Sections V.a. and b. above for further discussion.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element does not propose any projects that would involve extensive excavation that could result in the disturbance of any designated cemetery or other burial ground or place of interment. Please see Sections V.a. through c. above for further discussion.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a. Would the project 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.

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Per Plate 2 of the Seismic Safety Element of the General Plan, the most significant fault system in the City is the Newport-Inglewood fault zone. This fault zone runs in a northwest to southeast angle across the southern half of the City.

The Mobility Element would be consistent with all chapters of the General Plan, including the Seismic Safety Element. The Mobility Element is a policy document that provides a list of Capital Improvement Program projects as well as implementation measures intended to improve multimodal mobility throughout the City. All future projects included in this Element will be subject to separate environmental review in accordance with CEQA. In addition, all new construction is required to comply with current building codes and incorporate building methods that account for the possibility of seismic events. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Newport-Inglewood fault zone could create substantial ground shaking if a seismic event occurred along that fault. Similarly, a strong seismic event on any other fault system in Southern California has the potential to create considerable levels of ground shaking throughout the City. However, numerous variables determine the level of damage to a specific location. Given these variables, it is

not possible to determine the level of damage that may occur on the site during a seismic event. All future projects listed in the Mobility Element must conform to all applicable State and local building codes relative to seismic safety. Please see Section VI.a.i. above for further discussion.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Per Plate 7 of the Seismic Safety Element, most of the City is located in areas of either minimal or low liquefaction potential. The only exceptions are in the southeastern portion of the City, where there is significant liquefaction potential, and the western portion (most of the area west of Pacific Avenue and south of the 405 freeway), where there is either moderate or significant liquefaction potential. Please see Section VI.a.i. above for further discussion.

iv) Landslides?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Per the Seismic Safety Element, the City is relatively flat and characterized by slopes that are not high (less than 50 feet) or steep (generally sloping flatter than 1-1/2:1, horizontal to vertical). The State Seismic Hazard Zone map of the Long Beach Quadrangle indicates that the lack of steep terrain (except for a few slopes on Signal Hill and Reservoir Hill) results in only about 0.1 percent of the City lying within the earthquake-induced landslide zone for this quadrangle. Therefore, no impact would be expected and no further environmental analysis is required. Please see Section VI.a.i. above for further discussion.

b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Mobility Element is a policy document that provides a list of possible future multimodal mobility improvements throughout the City. All future project proposals will be subject to separate environmental review in accordance with CEQA. In addition, all future projects would be required to adhere to all applicable construction standards regarding erosion control, including best

management practices (BMPs), to minimize runoff and erosion impacts from earth-moving activities such as excavation, recontouring and compaction. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

c. 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Please see Section VI.b. above for discussion. All future projects would be constructed in compliance with all applicable building code requirements regarding soil stability.

d. 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Please see Sections VI.b. and c. above for explanation.

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 wastewater?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The entire City is served by an existing sewer system and therefore has no need for septic tanks or any other alternative waste water disposal systems. No further environmental analysis is required.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element is a policy document that would not encourage or enable the exposure of hazardous materials to the public. All future projects listed in this Element will be subject to separate environmental review in accordance with CEQA. In addition, all handling and disposal of any hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would be in full compliance with Long Beach Municipal Code Sections 8.86 through 8.88 as well as all existing State safety regulations. No further environmental analysis is required.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Please see Section VII. (a) above for discussion.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Please see Section VII. (a) above for discussion.

d. Would the project 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with

CEQA requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. All future projects listed in the Mobility Element would be subject to separate CEQA review that would include analysis of information from the Cortese List. Please see Section VII.a. above for further discussion.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Long Beach Airport is located within the City, just north of the 405 freeway between Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard. The Mobility Element would not alter air traffic patterns or encourage future projects that could conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones. Passenger access and goods movement at the Long Beach Airport are addressed in this Element as an important regional air traffic facility that is part of the City's comprehensive and efficient mobility system. All future development in the vicinity of the Long Beach Airport would be in compliance with all applicable local and FAA requirements. Please see Section VII.a. above for further discussion.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

There are no private airstrips located within or adjacent to the City. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element would be consistent with all chapters of the General Plan, including the Public Safety Element. The Mobility Element would not encourage

or otherwise set forth any policies or recommendations that could potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No further environmental analysis is required.

h. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The City is a highly urbanized community and there are no properties located adjacent to wild lands and there is no risk of exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. No further environmental analysis is required.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has produced a series of Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) designating potential flood zones (based on the projected inundation limits as well as the 100-year flood as delineated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers).

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element would be consistent with all chapters of the General Plan, including the Conservation Element. All future projects listed in this Element would be in full compliance with all applicable federal, State and local water quality standards and regulations. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Would the project 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 planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

Please see Section VIII.a. above for discussion. The City is a highly urbanized community with the water system infrastructure fully in place to accommodate future development consistent with the General Plan.

c. Would the project 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element does not encourage or enable any alterations to existing drainage patterns or to the course of streams or rivers. Please see Section VIII.a. above for further discussion.

d. Would the project 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

Please see Sections VIII.a. and c. above for discussion.

e. Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

Please see Sections VIII.a. and c. above for discussion. The City's existing storm water drainage system is adequate to accommodate runoff from any future projects, which would be subject to separate environmental review in accordance with CEQA.

f. Would the project otherwise degrade water quality?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Please see Sections VIII.a. and c. above for discussion. All future projects listed in this Element would be subject to all applicable water quality standards, regulations and best management practices (BMPs).

g. Would the project place Mobility 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), most of Long Beach is located in Zone X, which is outside of the 100 year flood hazard area. All future projects listed in this Element would be subject to separate environmental review in accordance with CEQA.

h. Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Please see Section VIII.g. above for discussion.

i. Would the project 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Please see Section VIII.g. above for discussion. The City of Long Beach is not located in the proximity of a levee or dam.

j. Would the project result in inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

According to Plate 11 of the Seismic Safety Element, the majority of Long Beach is not within a zone influenced by the inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Potential tsunami hazards would be limited to properties and public improvements near the coastline. Please see Section VIII.g. for further discussion.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

a. Would the project physically divide an established community?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element is a chapter of the Long Beach General Plan. This Mobility Element builds upon the other General Plan chapters and would remain consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the entire General Plan. The goals and policies of this Mobility Element are not intended to divide any established community. Rather than divide any established communities, the Mobility Element is intended to increase connectivity for all neighborhoods and communities in the City by encouraging maintenance and improvement of all local transportation modes.

As part of this Mobility Element, the City proposes a context-sensitive street classification system that addresses how a street interfaces with adjacent land uses and buildings, as well as how the street will serve to mobilize people including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit drivers and passenger vehicle drivers. Both environment and function are important considerations when creating seamless connections between multiple transportation modes.

This Mobility Element lists a total of 51 Capital Improvement Program projects and 57 implementation measures. Capital Improvement Program projects considered in this Element include the Pacific Coast Highway Traffic Circle Redesign, Grade Separation at the Pacific Coast Highway/7th Street/Bellflower Boulevard intersection, and widening the Cherry Avenue corridor from Pacific Coast Highway to Anaheim Street. Additionally, major regional public improvements such as interchange improvements to the I-710 Freeway are evaluated in the Mobility Element. Future implementation of the Mobility Element will be done within the City's existing mobility network. Since the details of Capital Improvement Program projects have yet to be defined, full environmental analysis of these projects cannot be done at this time. No specific construction

schedule or prioritization timetable has been established. All future improvement projects would be subject to separate CEQA review. No further environmental analysis is required.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

See Section IX.a. above for discussion. The Mobility Element would be consistent with all other chapters of the City's General Plan, including the Land Use Element and the Local Coastal Program. The General Plan seeks to better integrate land use and mobility planning in order to create a more sustainability city. This Element would not conflict the City's General Plan, the 2010 Strategic Plan, or any other applicable land use plans and policies. Impacts to existing local regulations would therefore be less than significant.

c. Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

See Sections IX.a. and b. above for discussion. The City is a highly urbanized environment characterized by in-fill development projects that recycle previously developed properties. The Mobility Element will be consistent with all other chapters of the General Plan, including the Conservation Element and the Open Space & Recreation Element. There are no habitats for any sensitive or special status species within transportation network of the City. No habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan would be impacted by Mobility Element implementation.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Historically, the primary mineral resources within the City of Long Beach have been oil and natural gas. However, oil and gas extraction operations have diminished over the last century as the resources have become depleted. Today, extraction operations continue but on a reduced scale compared to past levels.

a. 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element does not propose any alteration of local mineral resource land uses and there are no mineral resource activities that would be altered or displaced by the Mobility Element. No further discussion is required.

b. 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Please see Section X.a. above for discussion.

XI. NOISE

Noise is defined as unwanted sound that disturbs human activity. Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. Noise level measurements include intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. Residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks and outdoor recreation areas are more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Future transportation improvement construction activities would involve various types of short-term noise impacts from trucks, earth-moving equipment, and depending on project site characteristics, activities that generate short-term loud noises and vibrations such as pile driving. However, all construction activities and land use operations must be performed in compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance (Long Beach Municipal Code Section 8.80). The Mobility Element would not alter the Noise Ordinance provisions or exempt any future Mobility projects from local noise controls. All future projects consistent with the Mobility Element would involve the same type of short-term noise producing actions and equipment typical of development projects. The local Noise Ordinance would continue to regulate all future land use construction and operational noise levels. In addition, all future projects would be subject to separate environmental review in accordance with CEQA. No further environmental analysis of this issue is necessary.

b. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

See Section XI.a. above for discussion. Future development construction activities consistent with the Mobility Element could expose persons to periodic ground borne noise or vibration (i.e., pile driving) during phases of demolition and construction. However, this type of noise would be typical for a construction site and would occur in compliance with local noise controls.

c. Would the project create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

See Section XI.a. above for discussion. The Mobility Element does not set forth or encourage any future projects that would result in a substantial permanent increase in noise levels. The Mobility Element goals, improvement programs and implementation measures would not encourage noise levels any higher than typically associated with existing land uses and multimodal activities.

d. Would the project create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

See Sections XI.a. and c. above for discussion.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Long Beach Airport is located within the City just north of the 405 freeway between Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard. The Mobility Element would not alter noise levels emanating from any future projects. Passenger access and goods movement at the Long Beach Airport are addressed in this Element as an important regional air traffic facility that is part of the City's comprehensive and efficient mobility system. All future development in the vicinity of the Long Beach Airport would be in compliance with all applicable local and FAA requirements. The Mobility Element would not alter air traffic patterns or encourage developments that could conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area excessive noise levels?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

There are no private airstrips located within or adjacent to the City. No further environmental analysis is required.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The City of Long Beach is the second largest city in Los Angeles County. At the time of the 2000 Census, Long Beach had a population of 461,522, which was a 7.5 percent increase from the 1990 Census. The 2010 Census reported a total City population of 462,257.

a. Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Mobility Element would be consistent with all other chapters of the General Plan, including the Land Use Element. The Mobility Element would not encourage population growth beyond the planned growth set forth in the General Plan. All future improvement projects listed in the Mobility Element would be consistent with the land use densities and intensities set forth in the General Plan Land Use Element and Zoning Code.

b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Mobility Element does not set forth or encourage any policies, projects or implementation measures that would directly or indirectly displace existing residential units in the City. The intent of the Mobility Element is to maintain and enhance all modes of transportation throughout the City. No further environmental analysis is required.

c. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Please see Section XII.b. above for discussion. The Mobility Element does not set forth or encourage any policies, projects or implementation measures that would directly or indirectly displace people residing in the City.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire protection would be provided by the Long Beach Fire Department. The Department has 23 stations in the City. The Department is divided into bureaus of Fire Prevention, Fire Suppression, the Bureau of Instruction, and the Bureau of Technical Services. The

Fire Department is accountable for medical, paramedic, and other first aid rescue calls from the community.

Police protection would be provided by the Long Beach Police Department. The Department is divided into bureaus of Administration, Investigation, and Patrol. The City is divided into four Patrol Divisions: East, West, North and South.

The City of Long Beach is served by the Long Beach Unified School District, which also serves the City of Signal Hill, Catalina Island and a large portion of the City of Lakewood. The District has been operating at or over capacity during the past decade.

Would the proposed 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Mobility Element would be consistent with all other chapters of the General Plan, including the Land Use and Public Safety Elements. The Mobility Element is a policy document rather than a development project, and it would not encourage growth beyond the goals, policies and programs established in the General Plan. This planned growth would not be of magnitude in added density and intensity to substantially affect the provision of fire protection services. All future project proposals will be subject to separate environmental review in accordance with CEQA. No further environmental review is necessary.

b. Police protection?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Similar to Section XIII.a. above, the Mobility Element is a policy document rather than a development plan, and as such would not significantly increase demands for police protection service, nor require provision of new police facilities.

c. Schools?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Similar to Section XIII.a. above, the Mobility Element is a policy document that will not result in an increased demand for public school services or facilities.

d. Parks?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Similar to Section XIII.a. above, the Mobility Element is a policy document that would not generate any additional demand for provision of park services or facilities by the City.

e. Other public facilities?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

No other impacts have been identified that would require the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities.

XIV. RECREATION

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Mobility Element is a policy document rather than a development project proposal, and it would not encourage growth beyond the goals, policies and programs established in the General Plan, including the Open Space & Recreation Element. Mobility Element implementation would also be in compliance with all applicable requirements of the local Dedication of Parks in Perpetuity Ordinance. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no further environmental analysis is necessary.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Mobility Element is a policy document rather than a development project and does not include any proposals for recreational facilities or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The Mobility Element would not encourage local growth beyond the goals, policies and programs established in the General Plan. This planned growth would not create significant increases in demand for parks or other recreational facilities. All future projects would be subject to separate CEQA review. No further environmental analysis is required.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

a. Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Mobility Element would not encourage growth beyond levels planned for in the General Plan. The Mobility Element would comply with State General Plan law to provide a comprehensive "complete streets" policy document. The overall intent of this Mobility Element is to improve traffic circulation patterns as well as increase opportunities for multi-modal forms of transportation. This includes a spotlight on bicycling as the City of Long Beach strives to become the most bicycle-friendly city in America.

While placing an emphasis on a multi-modal system, the City recognizes that the majority of travel miles within Long Beach will be done inside automobiles. City streets should be designed to efficiently move cars between neighborhoods, local and regional destinations, and freeways and highways. Left-turn lanes, right-turn pockets, standards that limit the location of driveways, on-street parking limitations, and other design features will be needed to facilitate vehicle flow on those corridors where automobiles are the primary mode of transportation. Auto-priority street corridors should be designed and managed to provide shorter vehicle travel times than parallel avenues or neighborhood streets. When necessary, neighborhood traffic-calming measures employed on residential

streets will discourage people from driving through neighborhoods, thereby minimizing disruptions and creating a safer, more pleasant environment for residents.

To create complete streets that meet the needs of all multi-mode transportation users, the City must make certain modifications to existing streets. These modifications will allow streets to better accommodate the City's planned network of pedestrian, bicycling and transit-priority corridors. Enhancing a street corridor for one mode of transportation may come at the expense of another transportation mode. For example, adding a bicycle lane or widening a sidewalk for pedestrians may require narrower or fewer lanes for vehicles. However, these compromises are needed to create a balanced transportation system that provides high-quality through-routes for each mode of travel.

Certain streets in Long Beach with excess vehicle capacity may be better suited for street redesign to better accommodate the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders. By reducing the width or number of travel and parking lanes, streets can be reconfigured to accommodate a variety of improvements such as wider sidewalks with trees, bike paths or lanes, dedicated transit lanes, and landscaped medians or curb extensions that make the streets more attractive and usable. Map 17 of the Mobility Element, Opportunity for Street Character Change, illustrates those streets that have potential for new character changing features.

As part of this Mobility Element, the City proposes a context-sensitive street classification system that addresses how a street interfaces with adjacent land uses and buildings, as well as how the street will serve to mobilize people including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit drivers and passenger vehicle drivers. Both environment and function are important considerations when creating seamless connections between multiple transportation modes.

The end result of this Mobility Element would be an efficient, balanced, and multimodal Citywide mobility network. This multimodal emphasis is depicted in several Mobility Element maps, including Map 14: Pedestrian-Priority Areas, Map 15: Bicycle Plan, and Map 16: Transit-Priority Streets. However, the exact timing and specific components of the possible transportation improvement projects and implementation measures has not yet been determined. No specific construction schedule or prioritization timetable has been established. Signal operations improvements are anticipated at various intersections. Signal synchronization along corridors and neighborhood traffic controls such as stop signs, roundabouts and improved pedestrian crossings will be evaluated in this Element. While this Mobility Element lists a total of 51 Capital Improvement Program projects and 57 implementation measures, the exact timing and specific components of these and other possible transportation improvement projects has not yet been determined. Since the details of Capital Improvement Program projects have yet to be defined, full environmental analysis of these projects

cannot be done at this time. All future projects would be subject to separate CEQA review and would be required to pay transportation developer fees. Therefore, the Mobility Element goals, improvement projects and implementation measures would not result in traffic growth beyond the levels planned for in the General Plan. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

b. Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Please see Section XV.a. for discussion. The Mobility Element would not alter land use patterns or encourage population growth beyond the levels set forth in the General Plan. Since the Mobility Element goals and policies would not encourage or plan for traffic growth beyond General Plan growth levels, there would be no significant impacts on levels of service.

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element would be consistent with all General Plan chapters, including the Land Use Element. Passenger access and goods movement at the Long Beach Airport are addressed in this Element as an important regional air traffic facility that is part of the City's comprehensive and efficient mobility system. All future development in the vicinity of the Long Beach Airport would be in compliance with all applicable local and FAA requirements. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element seeks to maintain and enhance all modes of transportation in the City. This Element would not create or encourage any hazardous

transportation related design features. No further environmental analysis is required.

e. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element would not propose or encourage any specific development projects or transportation network modifications that would have the potential to result in deficient or inadequate emergency access routes. No further environmental analysis is required.

f. Would the project conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Mobility Element would not set forth or encourage any proposals or projects that would conflict with any adopted alternative transportation policies. As part of the Mobility Element complete streets policies, the existing roadway network will be systematically evaluated for excessive right of way or roadway capacity that could be converted to other modes of travel, including busways, bike lanes, wider sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, and other similar facilities. The Mobility Element includes programs and policies for all modes of travel, involving the multimodal use of streets, or of parallel corridors working together where prevailing street widths or anticipated traffic volumes and speeds are not conducive to all modes of travel. A multimodal corridor would prioritize auto, bus and truck travel on a major arterial and would provide enhanced bicycle facilities in a nearby parallel street.

While the Mobility Element provides guidance for meeting goals and policies related to alternative transportation facilities, the exact timing and specific components of these and other possible alternative transportation projects has not yet been determined. All future projects would be subject to separate CEQA review. No further environmental analysis is required.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

c. Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

d. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

e. 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

f. Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

g. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

For Sections XVI.a. through g. - The Mobility Element would be consistent with all other chapters of the General Plan and would not be expected to place an undue burden on any utility or service system. The City of Long Beach is an urbanized setting with all utilities and services fully in place. Future demands for utilities and service systems have been anticipated in the General Plan goals, policies and programs for future growth. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

As determined in Section IV. Biological Resources and Section V. Cultural Resources, the Mobility Element would have no significant adverse impacts on biological or cultural resources. The Mobility Element would not degrade the quality of the environment, impact any natural habitats, effect any fish or wildlife populations, threaten any plant or animal communities, alter the number or restrict the range of any rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate any examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that

the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Mobility Element would be consistent with all other chapters of the General Plan and would not contribute to any cumulative growth effects beyond what is anticipated for the City's future in the General Plan.

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Many of the Mobility Element recommendations are "self-mitigating" in that they are specifically intended to reduce impacts that current circulation patterns have with respect to traffic, air emissions, public safety, municipal services and community cohesion. Finally, physical improvements associated with the Mobility Element cannot be undertaken without subsequent project-level environmental review that complies with requirements of CEQA. For these reason, the City has concluded that the Mobility Element can be adopted without causing significant adverse environmental effects and determined that the Negative Declaration is the appropriate type of CEQA documentation.